Bilingual educational language policies in context: A multidimensional examination of California's bilingual teaching authorization

A dissertation
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Kathleen Renae Mitchell

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Kendall King, adviser

May 2019

Acknowledgements

Completing this dissertation has been a lengthy process – much longer than I ever could have imagined when I started down the doctoral path eight years ago. I owe many thanks to those whose patience and well-timed nudges helped me **finally** to get to this point! I am genuinely grateful to many at University of Minnesota, for your support and collaboration during the three years I endured those winters, and more importantly to the long-distance emails, phone conversations, Skype sessions, and texts during the five years since I returned to the West Coast. Kendall, your work inspired me before I knew what a PhD entailed, and the truly remarkable depth and breadth of your scholarship and professionalism continue to inspire. Your guidance, flexibility, and faith in me have been the best balance of adviser-ship I could imagine. Dee, your longstanding history in the theoretical and practical fields of dual language education, your willingness to push me academically and professionally as well as support me emotionally, have meant so much. Misty, I am so grateful and humbled that you joined my committee from afar and stuck with me from even farther. Your feedback has pushed my perspectives on policy to a different level. Karla, thank you so much for your warmth and willingness to jump in at the final hour!

To my fellow SLC/SLE classmates, I *so* look forward to seeing where our professional and personal futures collide! To my dear friend Jason Martel, I am grateful that you have been my thought partner and cheerleader, in both time zones, for the entire duration. To Liz Boner, who knew that when you inspired me to run my first marathon 20 years ago that you would be such a model in the marathon that has been this degree? I am so thankful for your feedback, your practice sessions, and your trail companionship.

Here's to another 20 years of miles logged and systems challenged. To Michelle Benegas, words can't express how deeply I appreciate your unwavering friendship at all hours of the day and night. Not only am I so proud to consider you a colleague, I am so honored to feel a part of the Benegas family. May your daughters grow into the amazingly strong, generous, and articulate woman that you are.

I wouldn't be who I am without the steadfast support of my wife, Kalli. When I think of how many times I've asked you to sacrifice a stable zip code and your own practice on behalf of my career, I am humbled. From the big moves to the daily dish-doing, breakfast/lunch/dinner-making, and dog-walking you've taken on so that I can get this thing DONE, I will never be able to thank you enough. No more degrees, I promise.

Finally, thank you to my colleagues in Oakland Unified. Thank you for sharing yourselves with me and most importantly thank you for trusting me to analyze your experiences. Many thanks to Jean Wing and RAD staff who answered no end of small and big questions along the way. While those of us who stay in Oakland are ferociously proud to be "Oakland Strong", we all know there is so much work to be done on behalf of OUSD students, families, and employees. In this perpetually exhausting and stressful time of budget cuts, strikes, and defensiveness, I am honored that I work with such dedicated and creative critical thinkers and boundary pushers. I am also beyond grateful to be inspired by my students. There truly is no single word to describe the physical, emotional, and spiritual strength that they exhibit. May this examination of language ideologies and bilingual teacher support ultimately impact the schooling these students experience.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my father, who was severely injured in a car accident the first week I started classes at the University of Minnesota, and who passed away the first week I started data collection for this study. While no one should endure so much pain for so many years, his life-long faith that something better was just ahead has left an indelible imprint on me, and has guided my work in ways he will never know. To the power of hope!

Abstract

This study examines ideologies of language and orientations to bilingual education in California. Specifically, this study examines how three bilingually authorized first- and second-year teachers in one bilingual Oakland elementary school experienced professional development, and how that professional development connected, in multiple dimensions, to California's bilingual authorization policy. The findings of this study are fivefold. The first finding is that the state of California's legislative bodies and Commission on Teacher Credentialing promote an orientation toward bilingual education that does not match the visions of the bilingual teachers at the Oakland school, the English Language Learners and Multilingual Achievement office in Oakland Unified School District, nor subtle voices visible in California's bilingual authorization program standards. The language-as-problematic resource orientation produced by the State is problematic. Any promotion of languages other than English in bilingual education as less "academic" than English, or as secondary in priority to English, devalues these languages, their speakers, and the teachers who teach in them. Early-career teachers in this study interpreted this unequal valuation with varying degrees of discomfort, from outspoken resistance to self-minimization.

The second finding, that Oakland Unified's model of distributed leadership may contribute to uneven and inequitable outcomes of teacher support, highlights the importance of professional development of teacher educators in bilingual settings. When left on his own to decide what he thought would be useful professional development, Olmeda's monolingual (in English) instructional coach drew upon his own contextual understandings to plan and conduct professional development sessions. This context did

not match the needs of teachers, specifically those who taught in Spanish. The third finding, that early-career teachers can access professional development and grow through it when they are able to work within their individual zones of proximal development, is not surprising. However, what is visible in this study is how the structures of California's teacher induction requirement interrupted professional growth due to rigid timing and perceptions of English as the only language usable during induction. Connected to this third finding is the fourth, that when professional development tasks are viewed as interruptions to "real" professional growth – in other words, as hoops through which to jump – they also may position the requir*ers* of development, i.e. the District or the State, as forces to oppose. This oppositional positioning runs counter to collaboration paramount to successful growth in a classroom, coaching, or other teaching and learning environment.

Finally, the fifth finding, that English became the default language and English Learners became the default "struggling learners" during a BTSA induction project – even though the language of instruction was Spanish – connects directly back to the first finding's hierarchizing of English in bilingual education. In this manner, I show how, to use Levinson et al.'s (2009) terminology, the State, via its orientation to bilingualism and biliteracy in education, defines reality, orders behavior, and allocates resources in ways that promote inequality. Important discussion topics around the importance of "critical consciousness" (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017) in bilingual education arise from these findings.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Context Matters: An Introduction to the Study

Background and Rationale

At any given moment, an individual school represents an amalgam of professionals educated and trained at multiple institutions across various points in time. The same can be said for the broader professional and legislative network that is connected to school-level and classroom-level decision-makers. Individuals carry with them belief systems shaped by their own life experiences, including but certainly not limited to education and training. As such, to address any of the myriad issues that arise within pK-12 education, a system in constant motion, it is important to consider how to strengthen *both* individual and systemic capacities within this network. Designing a path to arrive at systemic and individual growth requires, at minimum, knowledge of the elements that comprise the growth, as well as knowledge of how people learn, and importantly who the present learners are and what they already know. Classroom teachers perform, simultaneously and multiple times a day, tasks of dreaming, backwards planning, instructing, assessing, reflecting, and aligning their decision-making to the standards they have agreed to teach. More tangible than standards, however, teachers align their instruction to students present, past, and (maybe, if they see themselves sticking it out) future. Classroom teachers are educated and trained to do all of this based on research-based theories of education. How they in turn interpret and apply these theories of education depends on aforementioned variables. Little research has considered a site-based ecology of teachers who have moved through teacher education during a similar time frame, across institutions within one state, and who come together as not-just-teachers, but as *learners*, in one school. Further, research has not yet explored links

between state-level bilingual education credential policy, school district and school-level programming around bilingual teacher professional development, and early career bilingual teachers' sense-making of these multiple sites' efforts to develop skilled professionals. To capture a holistic picture of what knowledge, skills, and abilities bilingual teachers in California are expected to demonstrate *and* how early-career bilingual teachers are faring given multiple kinds of support during their first years, research is needed that examines the interconnected layers of education, expectations, and experiences of teachers, all the while considering these experiences within a broader web of individual and institutional influence. This study illuminates the struggles and successes of early-career bilingual teachers to connect their in-service professional development to their daily practice, and thereby highlights potential areas school districts and school leadership teams can target to support and retain teachers.

Since the establishment of formal education systems, bilingual[1] education around the globe has been practiced in wide variety of contexts (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh 2010, p. 2; Stern 2009, p. 70). Bilingual, or Dual language (DL) programs, as they are currently defined in the U.S., embrace bilingualism and biliteracy, academic achievement, and goals related to sociocultural competence (Howard, Lindholm-Leary, Rogers, Olague,

[1] For this dissertation, I use the term "bilingual" to refer to any instruction that has included more than one language, regardless whether the goal has been for students to transition away from home languages to English, or for students to develop bilingually – and regardless of the linguistic background of students. The state of California labels its authorization as "bilingual" – the ideologies connected to this word are examined in this dissertation. I use the term "dual language" only when citing others' research that uses this term, though both OUSD and the most current version of CAL's *Guiding Principles* use "dual language". Previous research cited may also refer to immersion or dual language/immersion (DLI).

Medina, Kennedy, Sugarman, & Christian, 2018, p. 3). Over the past 50 years of programming and research in Canada and the U.S., two countries that have shared research and researchers, the contexts of bilingual education have varied appreciably; the field continues to expand and reorganize according to shifting landscapes of research, legislation, community demands, demographics, and the like. For example, though the 2011 definition of dual language education (Tedick, Christian, & Fortune, 2011, p. 2) includes the following language: "goals of additive bilingualism, high academic achievement, and a goal related to culture", more recently scholars have posited:

> [t]he language practices of today's bilinguals do not respond to an additive or subtractive model of bilingualism. In today's flows, language practices are multiple and ever adjusting to the multilingual multimodal terrain of the communicative act; that is, bilingualism is dynamic. (García, Flores, & Woodley, 2012, p. 50)

Further, scholars have documented the "multilingual turn" in language education (see also Conteh & Meier, 2014; May, 2013), wherein language use is not positioned from a monolingual perspective (e.g., "Use *either* this language *or* that language in this space") but rather viewed as explicable only through consideration of a more holistic context (de Jong, Li, Zafar, & Wu, 2016). Serving as a conduit between scholars, policymakers, and pK-12 practitioners, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), recently revised the *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (3rd ed.) (Howard et al., 2018). In addition, national standards of preparation for dual language teachers have also been proposed (Guerrero & Lachance, 2018). These publications respond to current and evolving theoretical and empirical work and thereby advance the field more broadly in

spheres of education policy and practice. Bilingual public education in the state of California continues to reorganize as well, as voters in this direct democracy have been some of the first in the U.S. to both limit (in 1998, via Proposition 227) and more recently re-introduce (in 2016, via Proposition 58) state-wide access to bilingual education. Within this shifting landscape, the field of bilingual education is missing both a comprehensive body of research into California's bilingual teacher preparation – pre-service and in-service – and research that examines teachers' sense-making of the multiple forces of support that are geared toward their success. As California moves to re-expand bilingual programming, it is particularly important for administrators, school districts, and California education preparation providers (EPP[2]s) to see their efforts within a broader network of supports and educational policy contexts of bilingual education in California. This dissertation provides a window into the experiences of on-the-ground practitioners, connected to policies and the teacher education linked with those policies. These experiences highlight successful connections and mismatches; an examination of both within broader dimensions of time, space, and power sharpens our focus on areas to consider and improve.

Overview of the Study

This study examines how three bilingually authorized first- and second-year elementary teachers in one bilingual school experience professional development, and how that professional development is connected to California's bilingual authorization

[2] For continuity, though different organizations use different terminology, I use the term "education preparation provider" throughout this dissertation to refer to any provider of coursework and training that leads to preliminary or clear elementary teacher credentials.

policy. More specifically, this study looks at how, in California, a state-level policy and local policy actors, some of whom have never seen the state-level policy, are interconnected. Via an analysis of State of California policy documents pertaining to the bilingual authorization, alongside the state's and one school district's policies around professional development, more broadly, this study analyzes the explicit and implicit language policies of bilingual teacher education in California.

This project addresses the following research questions:

1. How are the language ideologies and language planning orientations that circulate around California's elementary teaching credential authorizing bilingual instruction produced and interpreted at multiple dimensions of policy development and implementation?
2. How do these ideologies and planning orientations intersect with professional development for early career teachers in one local schooling context, and what are the ramifications of these intersections?
    a. How does a school district that hosts bilingual schools interpret professional growth for multiple subject (i.e., elementary teacher) bilingual authorization holders who teach in bilingual schools?
    b. How does an individual bilingual elementary school interpret professional growth for bilingual teachers?
    c. How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?

To answer these questions, I designed an ethnographic language policy study that considers the ecology of one bilingual school's faculty members who were deeply involved in their early-career teachers' performance and growth. In foregrounding teachers' voices, this study makes salient for policy-makers and educational leaders the experiences of professionals entering the field of bilingual elementary education. For scholars engaged in critical education policy work, this study furthers considerations of how to connect local actions across time, space, and dimensions of power, thereby strengthening the empirical foundation of what we already "know" – that our actions and inactions have deep ramifications that often further entrench inequities of race and language.

Significance of the Study

This study responds to Varghese's (2008) call for research that highlights the ideologies of "actual stakeholders involved with bilingual education…[who] have complicated ways of viewing and practicing bilingual education" (p. 304). It also offers a glimpse into a gap of pre-service teacher education that Faltis and Valdés (2017) discuss:

> We have no information at present on what teacher educators in all their roles understand about language and language diversity, the level of competency they possess for preparing students for teaching language integrated with content in linguistically diverse classrooms, their attitudes toward language and language diversity in schools, or their competency for teaching preservice teachers about language uses and language demands in and across content areas. (p. 555)

This gap is especially pertinent to pre-service and in-service support – especially of early-career teachers in bilingual settings. More broadly, this study explores "whom" policy is

written "for." If a state level policy exists that defines the types of bilingual instruction that are eligible under California's bilingual authorization, how is this information making its way to bilingual teachers? In other words, is this policy "for" teachers as well as "for" those who prepare them to teach?

As with most qualitative research, the goal of this study is not to produce generalizable results; rather, by providing a close examination of one interconnected group of educators, this study expands a field of research exploring "institutionalized" requirements in policy contexts where individuals may complicate or differently understand the institutional goals of, here, bilingual education (see also Dantas-Whitney and Waldschmidt, 2009; Varghese, 2006). Finally, this study is written as a contribution to on-the-ground practitioners in bilingual education and in-service teacher education. As findings indicate, there are many points of departure for improving early-career bilingual teacher support, particularly in terms of support that meets teacher-defined needs at their own pace, in languages other than English.

Overview of the Chapters

This dissertation is organized into seven chapters. In the present chapter, I have touched on a gap in research in terms of studying how bilingual education credential policies are connected to bilingual teacher professional development. In Chapter 2, I provide a review of literature pertaining to bilingual teacher education, including examinations of student and instructor perspectives during teacher education. I also review two areas of Critical Language Policy (CLP) scholarship – ethnography of language policy and language policies across dimensions of time and space. Finally, I detail the two bodies of work from which I draw my approach to data analysis: Richard

Ruiz' orientations to language planning, and multi-scalar, multi-axial analyses of policy appropriation. In Chapter 3, I describe in detail the study design – its critical social theoretical framework and combined methods of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and ethnography. I also describe data sources and provide an historical background to California's teacher credentialing process and standards of practice. Chapter 3 closes with an introduction to Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) and the teachers and support network at Olmeda Elementary. Chapter 4 addresses Research Question 1, examining language ideologies and language planning orientations of California's bilingual authorization and of Olmeda teachers, coaches, and administrators. What emerges is a longstanding language-as-problematic-resource orientation in State documents. In other words, even though the majority of California voters have expressed shifting ideas about bilingual education – from Proposition 227 in 1998 to Proposition 58 in 2016, the State authorizes bilingual instruction primarily as a resource to learn English, secondarily to learn content in a "primary language." At the OUSD district and Olmeda school levels, individuals contested, questioned, or aligned with this position; their histories of work in urban education connect to these positions.

Chapter 5 addresses Research Question 2, providing an ethnographic interpretation of how each of the three early-career teachers in this study experienced professional development. Four findings emerge from this interpretation. First, "distributed leadership," an OUSD model of shared growth and accountability at the school level, opened potential gaps in understanding and teaching when leadership was distributed among individuals with different educational histories. Second, teachers made professional growth when they engaged in their own zone of proximal development

(Jones, Rua, & Carter, 1998; Shabani, Khatib, & Ebadi, 2010; Vygotsky, 1978, Warford, 2011). Professional development models envisioned for broad groups of people, such as OUSD's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) assignments, did not always meet the individual needs of teacher-learners if teachers did not or could not engage within their ZPD. Similarly, group professional development sessions that fell outside teachers' contexts or ZPDs also fell short of providing meaningful opportunities to push practice. Third, professional development that was viewed as a "hoop" through which to jump resulted in inconsistent engagement and professional growth. Finally, even among the most activist bilingual faculty, the hegemony of English influenced how teachers talked about their "underperforming" students, referring to their students as English Learners even when they were in a Spanish context. These findings are further discussed in Chapter 6, where I explore how, even in a progressive bilingual school, among progressive bilingual teachers in a progressive district, English is still privileged at the expense of the minoritized language, here, Spanish. To do this, I examine connections among dimensions of time, space, and power, and place these connections in context of participant experiences. Finally, in Chapter 7, I discuss implications of these findings, and offer recommendations for future areas of research and policy change, particularly in the area of critical consciousness in teacher education.

Overall, this project demonstrates the complexities of how ideologies of language and actions of people operating among various dimensions of education directly and indirectly connect to early-career bilingual teacher professional development. Though individuals among these dimensions may be experts in their respective domains, the systems through which they interconnect do not always require or provide opportunities

to communicate with experts in bilingual education. Gaps in and mismatches of ideologies and experiences may arise, and these can be consequential. A careful consideration of points of intersection between the bilingual authorization and emergency, intern, and preliminary teaching credentials, along with teacher induction, must be undertaken to better inform bilingual teacher recruitment, support, and retention.

Chapter Two: Orienting to Ideologies of Language, Language Planning, Critical Scholarship, and Bilingual Teacher Education: A Review of the Literature

In California, to teach in a public school bilingual classroom, unless teaching as an English counterpart, the state requires a bilingual authorization[3] be added to a multiple-subject (e.g., elementary) or single-subject (e.g., science) credential. This study is grounded in the stance that a bilingual authorization of a California teaching credential is an educational language policy. Whereas language policy applies to "how languages are managed, or, perhaps more accurately, how languages are used to manage people, power, and resources in our world" (García & Kelly-Holmes, 2016, p. 2), educational language policy applies to how languages of instruction and interaction in school environments are institutionalized, valued, and negotiated or contested (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Johnson & Johnson, 2015). Language acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989), alongside orientations to language planning (Ruiz, 1984; 2010) frame this position. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), via California's bilingual authorization, explicitly labels the types of instruction the state considers as "bilingual." The CCTC, via the bilingual authorization program standards, also articulates the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs[4]) essential to teach bilingually. Accreditation to prepare candidates for a bilingual authorization requires that education preparation providers (EPPs) meet California's bilingual authorization program

[3]Though this moniker changed in 2008 to "bilingual authorization", most OUSD members still use the name "BCLAD" (Bilingual Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development) to refer to the authorization.

[4] The phrase "knowledge, skills, and abilities" (KSAs) is used by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing when referring both to educator program standards and teacher performance exams.

standards. These standards address 1) program design; 2) assessment of candidate competence; 3) the context for bilingual education and bilingualism; 4) bilingual methodology; 5) culture of emphasis; and 6) assessment of candidate language competence (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing [CCTC], 2015b). Via the articulation both of what bilingual teachers need to know and what bilingual teacher preparation programs need to do to ensure teachers are prepared, the State (here, the CCTC) is planning and authorizing what "counts" in terms of bilingual educational contexts and teachers' classroom practices, while at the same time setting criteria for what pieces of language and culture are necessary to satisfy a "bilingual" label. This study traces how an educational language policy is interpreted and externalized by multiple participants in California's education policyscape.

As such, alongside Richard Ruiz' (1984; 2010) orientations to language planning, discussed in the following section, three areas of research inform the research questions. First, drawing on critical policy research that has examined connections between broad and local language policies in action (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014; Johnson, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Mortimer, 2016; Valdiviezo, 2013), this study explores local understandings of language policies as they intersect at multiple dimensions with California's bilingual teaching authorization. The application of different conceptual tools to examine how local actors navigate and create policies (Johnson, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2015) or reproduce belief systems (Mortimer, 2016; Valdiviezo, 2013) provides multiple layers of interpretation of how policies and people are connected. In the studies cited above, language policies and/or the people interpreting them promote conflicting ideologies around languages and language speakers. In my study, uneven interpretations

of languages or language speakers' needs, connected to the ideologies displayed in the bilingual authorization text, in turn culminate in unbalanced teacher support.

Second, the articulation of standards of professional knowledge, skills, and abilities required of bilingual teachers is examined (Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Palmer, Heiman, Schwerdtfeger, & Choi, 2017; Guerrero & Lachance, 2018; Faltis & Valdés, 2016; López & Santibañez, 2018). This area of research would be an area one might expect to inform bilingual teacher licensure and accreditation of EPPs. However, though the three long-standing goals of dual language education – academic achievement, bilingualism/biliteracy, and sociocultural competence – form the basis of any description of "dual language" programming, there is limited research pertaining to the establishment of bilingual or dual language teacher standards in any state. Further, while current districts and states may be framing bilingual education as "dual language" and aspirational for all students, the longer history of federally-legislated bilingual education in the U.S. is rooted in the 1968 Bilingual Education Act's emphasis on civil rights for language-minoritized children (de Jong, 2011; Flores & García, 2016). California's bilingual program standards were last adopted in 2009, and the overwhelming majority of research cited in its program standards handbook dates prior to 2004. Scholars and advocates have been drafting national dual language education teacher preparation standards at the same time that I have been drafting this study, and they have included a fourth goal to bilingual education – that of critical consciousness (Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Palmer, Heiman, Schwerdtfeger, & Choi, 2017; Guerrero & Lachance, 2018). This fourth goal has been proposed to address multiple research findings that privilege English and English speakers in bilingual settings.

The third area of research informing this study explores bilingual teachers' pre-service and in-service experiences of education (Cahnmann, Rymes, & Souto-Manning, 2005; Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009; Day & Shapson, 1996; Varghese, 2004; Varghese, 2006; Varghese & Snyder, 2018). Varghese's (2004, 2006) research stands alone as examining professional development of *specifically* early-career (provisionally credentialed or apprentice) bilingual teachers. These studies highlight examples of multiple and sometimes conflicting interpretations of goals of bilingual education. The authors also articulate areas of challenge that pre-service and in-service bilingual teachers confront – from struggles against corporate definitions of language proficiency (Cahnmann et al., 2005) to struggles against feelings of marginalization or isolation (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Varghese, 2006; Varghese & Snyder, 2018), to struggles to develop critical consciousness (Cahnmann & Varghese, 2005; Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009) or specific pedagogical skills (Day & Shapson, 1996). My study contributes to this field of research in that it uniquely considers points of intersection among trajectories of time, space, and power, as to how early-career bilingually-authorized teachers experience a form of professional development (BTSA program) that also must be aligned to California induction program standards. It also highlights how a third participant, ineligible for BTSA coaching, experienced marginalization during professional development, even within a school and school district that are deeply committed to multilingualism and social justice. A deeper look as to how various actors in OUSD navigate local and wider educational language policy contexts in California provides insight to scholars as to how policy language is interpreted in local contexts. It also provides insight to school districts, administrators,

and EPPs about how better to support the unique, specific needs of their bilingual teachers.

Language Ideologies and Language Planning Orientations: An Architectural Foundation

Blommaert writes that "[l]anguage is the architecture of social behavior itself" (2009, p. 263). As such, how policymakers negotiate educational language policies is inextricably linked to their own experiences with and interpretations of education, language, and language planning. This study examines how ideologies of language and ideological orientations to language planning impacted the daily realities of teachers. In other words, where, how, and by whom were these ideologies constructed; through what semiotic and social processes were they communicated; and what were the consequences for early-career bilingual teachers?

> Woolard's (1998) articulation of language ideology serves as part of this frame: Representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world are what we mean by 'language ideology'… Further, ideologies of language are not about language alone. Rather, they envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality, and to epistemology. (Kindle Loc. 112-116; see also Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994)

In this study, I explore this intersection of language and humans, as this intersection both undergirds and, I contend, reproduces beliefs about bilingualism and bilingual education in California. Reproduction of belief systems may be visible in policy language; I will argue that this is the case with California's bilingual authorization. In addition, following van Dijk (2001), I also look for indirect ideological influences within discourses of study

participants. As he writes, these indirect influences "may be instantiated as individual opinions of group members represented in their mental models about specific people and events, which in turn control meaning production of text and talk about such events" (p. 17).

Along with a descriptive view of ideology, I consider a critical approach because, as Woolard writes, the practical construal of ideologies has consequences (1998, Kindle Loc. 241-242), in that ideologies are "representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination, and exploitation" (Fairclough, 2003, p. 9). In this study, I excavate the ideological foundations of conceptualizations of bilingualism in one California policy, school district, and school, and tie these conceptualizations to relationships of power. As language planning reproduces ideologies of bilingualism, closely connected to ideologies of language are orientations to language planning. To explore these ideologies and orientations, I use Ruiz' (1984) orientations to language planning to examine the data collected. These frames have been used widely in the literature for decades, though not without challenge (cf. Petrovic, 2005; Ricento, 2005; & Ruiz' [2010] response) or extension, (cf. de Jong et al, 2016; Flores, 2017; Lo Bianco, 2001). As such, they represent clearly delineated ideological foundations that can illustrate the language ideologies of discourses in this study.

Orientation represents "a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society"; these orientations "determine what is thinkable about language in society" (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16). In his seminal 1984 essay, Ruiz proposed three orientations to language planning: language-as-problem, language-as-

right, and language-as-resource. Language-as-problem orientations view languages other than the dominant language (English in the U.S.) as obstacles to be overcome. Minoritized languages are problems; it is not a far reach to an ideology that language minority speakers are too. Transitional bilingual education, which is currently being phased out of OUSD, is an example of planning that views languages other than English as a problem. Students in transitional programs are educated in home languages just long enough to be able to succeed in English. Home languages have a "value" only as stepping stones to a more "valuable" language.

Language-as-right orientations, for Ruiz, could be viewed from two angles – human rights and civil rights. Examples of language-as-rights in his essay are numerous; Ruiz wrote that a list would be "exhaustive" but included Macias' suggestion of "two kinds of language rights: 'the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language' and 'the right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life' (1979: 88-89)" (1984, p.23). The somewhat nebulous treatment of "rights," especially if viewed in opposition to "resource" (though they are not mutually exclusive), has been examined for years. In 2010, Ruiz published a clarifying response to critics of his less-than-direct stance advocating for the irrefutable rights people have to their home and/or heritage languages. This 2010 chapter was also a counter to three arguments that had been developed in response to ideologies underlying a language-as-resource orientation. Ruiz wrote that he offered his concept of orientations as frames that could, based on the "universe of discourse" one was coming from, mean different things. A language-as-resource orientation, when used by people to promote heritage languages as an economic or military construct, or to serve capitalist power brokers and not those who belong to the

language community, would inhibit language-as-rights (2010, p. 157). He further clarified that language-as-resource, for him, was "conceptually prior" to the language-as-right orientation:

> [O]ne cannot reasonably talk about rights, much less affirm them, without a prior understanding of how rights are resources…[U]nless one sees language as a good thing in itself, it is impossible to affirm anyone's right to it… Rights are only rights if they are resources first. (pp. 165-166)

Ruiz' language planning orientations are thus based on ideologies that construct language and language speakers as they sit within broader social contexts. Following Fairclough (2001; 2003) and van Dijk (2001), these ideologies are both instantiated and reproduced through discourse, and critical discourse analysis is necessary in order to uncover these ideologies.

Critical Language Policy Scholarship

Critical language policy and critical policy analysis. This study orients "policy" along post-structural, critical frameworks, recognizing that any policy is inherently value-laden and political (Ball, 1993; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Weaver-Hightower, 2008). Further, as this study explores California teacher credentialing policies at the state, school district, and school level, it situates *public* policy as an expression of "patterns of decisions in the context of other decisions taken by political actors on behalf of state institutions from positions of authority" (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 4). This study orients away from more traditional views of education policy wherein, as Weaver-Hightower (2008) writes,

> solving educational problems requires finding the one likely solution on which to

> base policy, then using the resulting policy as a lever for predictable and efficient changes. Such a view relies on an assumption of value-neutral decision making, ignores issues of power, and underestimates the highly contested nature of education. It also relies excessively on assumptions of rationality and the power of human beings to fully understand intricate actions and events. The traditional view, further, grossly misjudges the complexity and grittiness, the false starts, the unabashed greed, and the crashing failures of some policy formation and implementation. (p. 153)

In contrast to traditional views, this study is aligned with the position (Ball, 1994; 2015; Levinson et al., 2009; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997) that policy is both a product and a process, in that "policy involves the production of the text, the text itself, ongoing modifications to the text and processes of implementation into practice" (Taylor et al., 1997). I examine particular texts – California's bilingual authorization, OUSD's documents specific to their teacher induction program, and one bilingual school's self-identified "problem of practice" – and appropriation of these policies through the enactment of teacher supports. Following Levinson et al. (2009), I choose to use the term "appropriation" to refer to how study participants respond to California's bilingual authorization-as-policy. For these authors, policy "[a]ppropriation occurs when the policy that was formed within one community of practice meets the existential and institutional conditions that mark a different community of practice" (p. 782). Tollefson (2006) distinguishes the label of critical language policy (CLP) research from "optimistic traditional research" in language policy as such: First, it "acknowledges that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-

makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups" (p. 42). Second, as with other critical approaches, CLP research works toward social change. Third, CLP research is influenced by critical theory.

My study is framed as a critical language policy analysis. As such, it draws from the field not only of CLP but also critical policy analysis (CPA). Diem, Young, Welton, Mansfield, and Lee (2014) cite both Levinson et al. (2009) and Weaver-Hightower (2008) in their examination of "the intellectual landscape of critical policy analysis"; first, articulating what constitutes CPA and second, what motivates scholars to use this approach to examine education policy. Via a literature review of CPA in educational policy research, they group the critical approaches into attention to five "fundamental concerns": 1) "the difference between policy rhetoric and practiced reality"; 2) focus on a particular "policy, its roots, and its development"; 3) attention to "the distribution of power, resources, and knowledge"; 4) "related to this attention is social stratification… focus[ing] on the broader effect a given policy has on relationships of inequality and privilege"; and 5) examination of "members of non-dominant groups who resist processes of domination and oppression" (p. 1072). Diem et al. point out that the researchers' work does not coalesce into a single, unified approach to CPA, as such a static definition "would imply a 'one best way' to conduct education policy research. Indeed, this would run counter to the epistemological variety out of which critical policy analyses are derived" (p. 1084). My study pays attention to both the third and fourth elements, above, in that it examines how ideologies connected to the bilingual authorization link to distribution of power and resources. This link appears much stronger to English than to Spanish, and this unequal distribution of resources in Spanish and

English maintains inequality and privilege of certain languages, language speakers, and language teachers.

For Levinson et al., CPA must attempt to address the questions of "What *is* policy? What does policy *do*?... [and] Who can *do* policy?" with close attention to "existing forms of domination, that which is made to seem natural or inevitable, [in order] to clear the way for a possible world of social justice and nondomination" (2009, p. 769). This study fits into the critical policy landscape, in the field of bilingual public education, interrogating the relationships teachers have with a particular written policy document, how they "do" the policy themselves, and how power, knowledge, and resources are distributed via this policy. Importantly, this study explores specifically how early-career participants in an educational policy arena experience others' interpretations of an educational language policy.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and ethnography of language policy: Stronger together. Labeling the written materials they examine as language policy documents, Delavan, Valdez, and Freire (2016) offer a CDA of the Utah Department of Education's discourses of promotion of dual language (DL) programming. Their analysis points to "what interests are served, and how each of the potential DL constituencies are [*sic*] discursively portrayed" (p. 3). In doing so, the authors show how language education in Utah is being sculpted discursively toward specific bilingual practices. Along with CDA, Delavan et al. use Ruiz' (1984, 2010) language planning orientations to position their analysis. The authors delineate three different DL constituencies in the state of Utah:

> (1) the maintenance constituency— students entering school speaking the DL target language; (2) the heritage constituency— students who start not speaking the DL target language but whose heritage is connected to it; and (3) the world language constituency—all other students, whose investment is in becoming bilingual in a "world language." (p. 3)

Delavan et al. examine discourses in DL promotional materials (brochures, websites, and media exposure) and show, via CDA, that throughout promotional materials, the language-as-resource orientation has been aligned with neoliberal discourses to promote, for certain language groups, an economic benefit. For example, they discuss extensive use in the promotional materials of the discursive strategy of (en)closure on economic themes and suggest that this not only strengthens the discourse of language as an *economic* resource (only), it also

> misdirect(s) the audience away from the politics of inequality… in the narrative constructed by the promotional materials, discursive misdirection and erasure were used to portray the white, world language constituency as the protagonist—the hero, the most important character—while the maintenance and non-white heritage constituencies were marginalized as minor characters. (p. 12)

While their findings are compelling as a contemporary analysis using Ruiz' language-as-problem, language-as-right, language-as-resource orientations, and their main character-minor character metaphor aptly applies to English and "other" languages in the bilingual authorization, their study can also serve as an example of Blommaert's (2005) critiques on the limits of CDA alone as a method. First, CDA by design has a

"linguistic bias" (p. 34), wherein a narrow grammatical focus on "available discourse" (p. 35) may not encompass a complete picture.

For instance, though Delavan et al. focus on promotional materials, they make no mention of what may be circulating in other venues, such as social media or local discussions, to challenge these orientations. Second, Blommaert cautions that "[i]n scholarship that aspires to a critique of the present system, it would be very unwise to assume universal validity for our ways of life" (p. 36). Blommaert draws on the writing of Henry Widdowson (1995, 1996, 1998), suggesting that, regardless of the moniker "critical," practitioners of CDA may not analyze the multiple ways that a text may be interpreted, falling into selective or partial analyses. In other words, "a capitalist framing of meanings is 'criticised' by substituting it with an anti-capitalist one" (p. 32). That is, while, for example, Delavan et al. highlight uneven ideologies of different language speakers in Utah's DL landscape, and they express concern with the "neoliberal turn" in education policy, it is possible to cross a metaphorical political aisle and find nothing wrong at a societal level in terms of this management of languages and education. Granted, crossing the aisle might also align more closely to sanctioned beliefs about the "rightful" dominance of English, Whiteness, and more, which would be at odds with critical theories that challenge structures of power and domination.

However, I posit that, if aligning with Blommaert, the authors' findings could be reinforced by connecting promotional materials to a study of how local communities interact with Utah's goals of DL education. As such, though California state documents pertaining to the bilingual authorization provide ample text to examine, they alone cannot provide a descriptive picture of the bilingual education policyscape of the state. To

attempt to interpret a policy without exploring people's experiences with it would fall into "assumptions of rationality" that Weaver-Hightower (2008) assigns to uncritical views of policy analysis. Via an ethnographic approach that seeks to understand the culture of a policy within the culture of a school, my study provides a multidimensional picture of California's bilingual education policy as it circulates through state and local levels, among dimensions of power, time, and space.

In the introduction to her book, *Ethnography and Language Policy* (2011, p. 3), McCarty cites Heller on "what a sociolinguistic, ethnographic analysis can bring us… an understanding of how things happen, and some sense of why they happen the way they do" (1999, p. 275). Johnson (2010) mitigates a sole focus on written text in his language policy research via ethnographic data collection in the Philadelphia school district (SDP). His examination of both macro-level (federal) language policy appropriation and local language policy creation around bilingual education in the SDP reveals how and why SDP members made decisions around bilingual education policy in their district. Johnson shows, via CDA, clear intertextual links between the (eventually drafted) SDP language policy and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Moving beyond text, data from his ethnography show how the drafters – and appropriators – of these language policies did not simply copy and paste federal policy into a district policy. Rather, the SDP appropriation of Title III

> relied on changing national language policy, Pennsylvania language policy, and, most importantly, the unique blend of educational ideologies circulating through the new community of educators. Educators make choices - they are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of language policies, no matter how strong

policy ‘discourses’ might be. (p. 76)

Ethnography of language policy represents a cogent “process and product” (McCarty, 2011 p. 82) through which to examine how early-career teachers and their support network in OUSD make sense of an educational language policy. To get at this sense-making and its implications, I draw on research that examines how to identify and interpret intersections of language policies across dimensions of time, space, and power.

Language policies across dimensions of time, space, and power. Scholars have explored various methods to better understand human interactions with policy-as-product and policy-as-process. Scalar frames have been proposed and applied by many (Blommaert, 2007, 2010; Canagarajah, 2013; Hult, 2010; Mortimer, 2016; Mortimer & Wortham, 2015; Wortham, 2006, 2012). Via an ethnographic study of two elementary schools and sixth grade classrooms (one urban, one rural) in the Central Department of Paraguay, Mortimer (2016) uses spatiotemporal scales to analyze Guarani and Spanish language policies, and teachers’ interpretations thereof. She succinctly ties together current scholars’ work to establish that conceiving of scales as “both spatial and temporal reminds us that meaning is made by the location of a sign in relationship to elements of context that may have longer or shorter histories as well as larger or smaller social domains” (p. 60). Mortimer uses the terms “upscaling” and “downscaling” to index the status of Guarani at different levels of society, providing a compelling examination of individual interaction with federal policy. Even though national policy “upscaled” Guarani to an official language in 1992, Mortimer reports that some urban teachers who were supposed to teach in Guarani opposed it, even many years later, saying that Guarani was for poorer, rural schools. Schools refused a label that would reference Guarani-

medium instruction, which held a negative connotation. Mortimer labels this assignation of status as a "downscaling" move. Mortimer reports that, even in the rural school that was one of the two sites for her study, where the majority of students spoke Guarani at home, teachers cited the national program as Spanish-medium. These individual actions, in effect, helped to suppress Guarani's status on a "lower scale spacetime as it traditionally had been. This longstanding indexical tendency remained stable, and Spanish remained—at least officially—the dominant language of instruction" (p. 64).

Similar to a scalar approach, Valdiviezo (2013) examines space and time by employing a horizontal and vertical "level" approach in her ethnographic study of language policies in bilingual intercultural education (EBI) in Peru. For Valdiviezo,

> vertical and horizontal analyses within an ethnography of LP add multidimensionality by illuminating connections (and lack thereof) between the macro and micro (vertical) and the past and present (horizontal). It becomes possible to make the case for dialogue between local and national actors as a fundamental sine qua non process that ought to precede transformation of LP. (p. 24)

Valdiviezo uses the horizontal metaphor to examine historically situated "ideological tendencies" (p. 24), from the Colonial period in Peru to the present, and the vertical positioning of both macro and micro-level interpretations of language policy from a global to a local scale. She does this "to emphasize the recognition of an inescapable point of reference in any approach or way of knowing" (p. 24). Using these two axes, Valdiviezo demonstrates the complexity of national shifting bilingual intercultural legislation that recognizes more extensively diversity (e.g., Quechua citizens and

education in Quechua) but also continues to prioritize "homogenizing ideologies" (p. 43) whereas Indigenous language speakers are required to learn Spanish but monolingual Spanish speakers are not required to learn other Indigenous languages. Placed alongside a vertical analysis of individual teachers' ideologies leaning toward these contradictory positions, Valdiviezo highlights the importance of engaging the teachers at points closer to legislative action in this policy process, in order to allow democratic dialogue and shifting understanding of the value of Indigenous language revitalization.

Though Mortimer and Valdiviezo identify the power that Spanish, as opposed to Indigenous languages, continues to hold among teachers in their study, when assembling a close examination of language policy appropriators in OUSD, I found myself wanting to read a closer examination of the language policy appropriators themselves. Where are the "inescapable point[s] of reference" for the individual teachers, i.e., their influences and experiences, that shape their language policy appropriation, and how are those points connected? Though not necessarily the goals of the authors' studies, examining these connections is central to my study.

Johnson and Johnson (2015) offer a theoretical model for more closely examining how language policy appropriation by some has more pronounced impact in schools and school districts. They build on Menken's (2008, p. 5) statement about how teachers are "the final arbiters of language policy implementation" and define a language policy arbiter as "any language policy actor (potentially: teachers, administrators, policy-makers, etc.) who wields a disproportionate amount of power in how a policy gets created, interpreted, or appropriated, relative to other individuals in the same level or context." (p. 225). Johnson and Johnson (2015) use the image of a funnel to show that,

> while policy decisions are socially negotiated between multiple actors within and across levels, at some point, there is one language policy arbiter [a narrowing in the funnel] who has singular power with regard to how a policy is interpreted and appropriated and all subsequent decisions in the policy process must funnel through them. (p. 226)

They use the language policy arbiter and funnel images to examine Washington State's educational language policy, the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program, and its influence and interpretation at two similar adjoining school districts in eastern Washington. Though hesitant to use their terminology of "arbiter" to label participants in my study, Johnson and Johnson's recognition that "not all individuals in all levels exhibit the same amount of power" (p. 222) is central to an analysis of how early-career teachers, who may often be the most vulnerable teachers in a school, experience an educational language policy. During the course of my study, it became clear that Xiomara, assigned BTSA coach to two of the three early-career teachers in this study, as well as the unofficial coach to the third, was a language policy arbiter at Olmeda Elementary, and *the* language policy arbiter in my study.

I build on Johnson and Johnson (2015) to add dimensions of power into my analysis of language policy production, interpretation, and appropriation. Though theoretically useful, for this study I struggled with the word "scale." To me, scale may reference hierarchical progression *or* extent of reach. The word might not be understood to reference both vertical and horizontal relationships at the same time. As the scholars using scalar models would agree, the wielding of power of a policy does not necessarily correlate with a hierarchical positioning of state at the top (scale) of the education policy

chain. Certain policy actions wield more widespread results (as in the passage of Proposition 227 in California, which constricted bilingual education for decades); however, those results are not received equally among the people who interact with the policies. While Mortimer's (2016) spatiotemporal scales attend to multiple contexts of time, as does Valdiviezo's (2013) horizontal axis, neither approach captures, for me, the elements of multidimensionality outside of a vertical or horizontal axis.

To extend Weaver-Hightower's (2008) metaphor of the "grittiness" of policy, because of the complexity of human behavior, grit does not tend to fall in straight lines. I believe an additional construct is needed to examine what may fall outside these axes of time and space. Though seasoned scholars might write that it is possible to use scalar analysis to do this, it is my position that the tool already carries multiple meanings; as a novice researcher, I prefer different terminology altogether. I discuss my use of a multidimensional model of language policy analysis in Chapter 3.

Bilingual Teacher Education: Perspectives on State and National Teacher Preparation

Research around what, precisely, are the knowledge, skills, and abilities required of teachers in U.S. bilingual classrooms would be an area one might expect to inform California's bilingual authorization. However, there is a lacuna of research in the U.S. from which the authors of California's bilingual authorization program standards can draw. Faltis and Valdés (2016) review literature of preservice teacher preparation specifically around preparation that focuses on developing knowledge, skills, and "inclinations" to teach in "linguistically diverse classrooms" (p. 549). While their review does not focus on bilingual education per se, they find a lack of articulation at the

national level of "organizational advocacy for scholarship on preparing teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms" (p. 556). It is unlikely, then, that the large teacher-preparation advocacy groups they cite (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], American Educational Research Association [AERA] and Association for Teacher Educators [ATE]), focus substantial attention on the smaller "linguistically diverse" field of bilingual education. As the authors write, a consideration of "the complex profiles of teacher educators and the cultural scripts about language and teacher preparation that they bring to the table" (p. 552) is essential, and arises as an area of misalignment in my study. It is in the intersection of instructional coaches' own professional histories and understandings with their coachees' experiences where relationships and understandings are built. These relationships are consequential. Faltis and Valdés (2016) write:

> We have no information at present on what teacher educators in all their roles understand about language and language diversity, the level of competency they possess for preparing students for teaching language integrated with content in linguistically diverse classrooms, their attitudes toward language and language diversity in schools, or their competency for teaching preservice teachers about language uses and language demands in and across content areas. (p. 555)

Faltis and Valdés devote considerable attention to discussing the importance of the concept of pedagogical language knowledge (Bunch, 2013; Galguera, 2011). While this terminology in the literature is still limited, the authors also write that pedagogical language knowledge –how language works, how language use can be modeled and scaffolded, and how multilingual students can draw on all their linguistic resources to

learn about language and content – "offers a potentially transformative avenue" (p. 580) for strengthening teacher education across disciplines and classroom settings. In bilingual classrooms and schools, pedagogical language knowledge should be a non-negotiable element of teacher and teacher educator education. Examined in Chapters 5 and 6, the absence of this sort of knowledge was visible in professional development sessions led by Wayne, one of the two instructional coaches, and it limited opportunities for growth, particularly for Melisa, one of the early-career teachers.

Faltis and Valdés (2016) also "strongly criticize the discourse on the language differences of minority students currently familiar to many teachers that has been characterized by a series of oppositions" (p. 570). Along with a consideration of bilingualism as requiring "separable competencies in two independent languages," I include some of their examples here: Native vs. nonnative speakers, social vs. academic language, and additive vs. subtractive bilingualism (p. 570). This oppositional positioning, for the authors, must be countered so that teachers and teacher educators can move beyond "simplistic dichotomous perspectives of all types" (p. 571). Evident in my study, oppositional positioning of "us" (classroom teachers) versus "them" (everyone else at the district and state levels) interrupted at times what might otherwise have been positive and productive professional interactions.

Drawing on Faltis and Valdés' (2016) literature review, López and Santibañez (2018) write of the importance of informing policy deliberations about the knowledge and skills necessary to teach in linguistically diverse classrooms. They organize three domains of knowledge outlined in Menken and Antuñez' (2001) suggested theoretical framework for preparing teachers in these settings: "knowledge of pedagogy,"

"knowledge of linguistics," and "knowledge of cultural and linguistic diversity" (p. 10). While their examination of certification requirements in three states (California, Arizona, and Texas) does not focus solely on bilingual education certification requirements, it does point to advantages of teacher-reported satisfaction and self-efficacy in Texas and California, two states with more specialized certification requirements. In my study, Wayne, an instructional coach, candidly discussed his growth in these same categories, but only as they related to learning about English and students designated as English Learners. What was missing for Wayne was experience in and contextual knowledge of a language other than English, along with knowledge of pedagogy, linguistics, and cultural/linguistic diversity among, specifically, Spanish and Spanish speakers. This gap in Wayne's knowledge informed, in part, how he led professional development sessions.

As noted by Guerrero and Lachance, "English counterpart teachers in dual language programs have typically been excluded from certification requirements," and it is encouraging to read, in the recently proposed national dual language standards, that *all* teachers who might be working in bilingual settings are held to professional capacities that are distinct to deliberate bilingual settings (2018, p. 9). In terms of these professional capacities, most relevant to this study is one of the four dimensions outlined in the national standards as essential to bilingualism and biliteracy – that of critical consciousness about bilingualism. The authors call this "critical language awareness" (2018, p. 16). This dimension builds upon Cervantes-Soon, Dorner, Palmer, Heiman, Schwerdtfeger, and Choi (2017), who call for a way to address multiple research findings in bilingual education that privilege English and English speakers in bilingual settings. Cervantes-Soon et al. propose a fourth pillar to two-way language immersion (TWI), and

are explicit that their use of TWI (not dual language) follows TWI's movement of bilingual education "beyond the aim of English monolingualism" (p. 407). Calling this domain "critical consciousness," they write of the importance that TWI community members be able to "problematize the history, culture, and societal configurations that brought them together" (2017, p. 419) in order to challenge a history and presence of English at the expense of other languages. They write, "[m]aking the development of critical consciousness TWI's fourth pillar draws strong attention to the power dimensions, hegemony of English and standardized languages, and subalternization of minoritized communities in bilingual education; it offers a decolonizing and humanizing framework for the future" (p. 421). Critical consciousness also forms a foundation of the fifth proposed national standard, which connects to professionalism, advocacy, and agency, as teacher candidates should be prepared "to *act*... to push the field of dual language education toward more equitable learning spaces" (Guerrero & Lachance, 2018, p. 62)

While, according to López and Santibañez (2018), California is preparing teachers to some extent to feel prepared to work with linguistically diverse students, my study contributes to this area of research by exploring how early-career teachers in bilingual settings feel prepared by coaching and professional development to do their work. As is visible between the work that Wayne and Xiomara performed, Wayne's preparation "up to" an English Learner authorization was not enough to lead professional development sessions that supported development outside of English – nor was Xiomara's preparation "beyond" a bilingual authorization enough to support her through coaching in a context that did not fit the more pressing needs of one of her coachees. Though the primary focus

of my study is on the experiences of early-career teachers via in-service teacher support, my study also contributes to this gap in the literature of teacher educators' critical consciousness and pedagogical language knowledge in bilingual settings, in that it broaches a conversation about how language ideologies undergird how teacher educators interpret language-in-education policies and therefore how they (re)produce these ideologies from positions of power during teacher education.

Bilingual Teacher Education: Pre-Service and In-Service Education Perspectives

North American research on pre-service and in-service teacher education in bilingual education has explored individual university programs (Bernhardt & Schrier, 1992; Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009; Mercado & Brochin-Ceballos, 2011; Varghese & Snyder, 2018; Wilson & Kawai'ae'a, 2007) and teacher professional development programs (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Varghese, 2004; Varghese, 2006). Findings across these studies document teachers' needs to connect with others for professional collaboration, growth, and community (Bernhardt & Schrier, 1992; Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Mercado & Brochin-Ceballos, 2011; Wilson & Kawai'ae'a, 2007); this is especially the case among people maneuvering similar questions of language and identity (Varghese & Snyder, 2018). In addition, findings demonstrate that programs vary in terms of the ultimate goals of bilingual education (Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009; Varghese, 2004; Varghese, 2006; Varghese & Snyder, 2018) and in coursework (Bernhardt & Schrier, 1992; Mercado & Brochin-Ceballos, 2011; Varghese & Snyder, 2018; Wilson & Kawai'ae'a, 2007).

Teacher educator positionality. In order to answer my research questions, particularly around the ramifications of how language ideologies and planning

orientations are produced and interpreted by study participants, it is important to root out the limited literature that pertains to bilingual teacher educators' understandings of bilingualism and bilingual education. The first study reviewed, by Dantas-Whitney and Waldschmidt (2009), offers a glimpse into the complexity of multiple individual and state-defined visions of bilingual education. The authors, as the co-instructors who planned, taught, and examined pre-service teachers' written reflections as part of an English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) – Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission terminology -- methods and materials class taken to add an ESOL endorsement onto teaching candidates' elementary licenses, may inadvertently have promoted conflicting messages of goals of bilingual education. This grouping of ESOL and bilingual teacher education reinforces rather than challenges an orientation toward English as the primary goal of bilingual instruction. In Oregon, the only licensure option for elementary dual language teachers at the time of the study was the addition of an ESOL endorsement onto a mainstream elementary teaching license; the authors' study highlights pre-service teacher education for future dual language teachers. By entitling their research article *Moving Toward Critical Consciousness in ESOL and Bilingual Teacher Education*, the authors present their course (and their study) as applicable to both bilingual classrooms and ESOL classrooms – though these two settings may not share the same goals. In fact, the two pre-service teachers' reflections examined were student teaching in two-way Spanish immersion schools.

The authors write that even though one of the focal students "professes her belief in the benefits for the dual-immersion program model, she is really seeing it as a compensatory model for ELL students and not a transformational model for all students"

(p. 71). A further inquiry into the structure of a university course that was required to cover both ESOL and bilingual methods would be necessary to see whether the authors-as-instructors were able to devote sufficient attention to bilingualism and biliteracy, or to content-based instruction - or if in fact they were teaching, in English, about teaching English, even if (and especially so, given the focus on critical consciousness) this teaching would have been done so in a space honoring multilingualism. Their students "were focusing solely on language skills, … often stopp[ing] short of examining larger social, political, cultural, economic factors that are behind ELLs' responses to the classroom context" (p. 69). However, how much of a bilingual or critically conscious "classroom context" was being examined by the instructors?

The authors clearly position themselves as researchers whose theoretical practices are influenced by critical and feminist pedagogies, and interpretive and hermeneutic traditions (p. 61), and their stated goal is to "identify areas for enhancement in our teacher education program to move teacher candidates beyond reductionist views of teaching and work toward culturally responsive pedagogy" (p. 60). In terms of teacher education, their findings are compelling: their students "viewed ESOL strategies as complete, universal, and painless techniques to make any ELL student succeed" (p. 68), and the students held "superficial acknowledgment of cultural issues, and contradictory attitudes about ESOL/bilingual education" (p. 61). Though the authors nicely articulate the challenge of navigating the situated nature of teaching and learning, as well as model a level of humility so important to reflective teaching, without articulation of the situated differences between teaching in ESOL and bilingual settings, it is possible to reflect a practice of "lumping together" all elementary students (and teachers) who are learning in

a language other than English as primarily English Learners. This practice erases students who may be simultaneous bilinguals, those learning in their third (or subsequent) languages, and trains teachers to think first about teaching English.

These complicated and sometimes competing orientations in linguistically diverse settings is reflected beyond Dantas-Whitney and Waldschmidt's (2009) study; throughout California policy documents specific to the bilingual authorization, examined in later chapters, similar issues arise. Varghese and Snyder (2018), discussed in the following section, draw closer attention to individual teacher candidate experiences in a similar program in Washington. In addition, Varghese (2004, 2006) has ethnographically explored multiple, conflicting beliefs among bilingual teachers and bilingual teacher educators. Attention to a nine-month professional development institute for provisionally certified bilingual teachers reveals how the two instructors of the institute did not consider local contexts in terms of their planning for this course and in fact held different views about the goal of bilingual education; one supported the goal of transitioning to English-only instruction by seventh grade. This goal contrasted sharply with that of many participants and the other instructor. While the reflective practice evident in Dantas-Whitney and Waldschmidt's (2009) work appears as absent among the instructors in Varghese's (2004, 2006) studies, it stands out as an essential area to examine when considering the situated nature of teacher professional growth. For instance, with respect to my second research question, as to how a school district and individual school interpret professional growth, instructional coach Wayne's own opportunities for professional growth or reflective practice occurred outside Olmeda, with other English literacy

coaches. These contextual mismatches can result in perpetuating an overemphasis on English at the expense of other languages, language speakers, and language teachers.

Participant experiences. Cammarata and Tedick, via their (2012) phenomenological examination of three dual language/immersion teachers' "lived experiences" during a year-long professional development on integrating content and language, detail five key dimensions that formed these teachers' lived experiences:

1. *Identity transformation*—seeing themselves as content *and* language teachers;
2. *External challenges*—facing time constraints, lack of resources, district pressures, and other factors that are outside of the teachers' control;
3. *On my own*—experiencing a growing sense of isolation;
4. *Awakening*—developing an increased awareness of the interdependence of content and language; and
5. *A stab in the dark*—having difficulty identifying what language to focus on in the context of content instruction. (p. 254)

One of the stated implications, that "more program-based support for teachers is needed if a balance of language and content is to become a pedagogical reality" (p. 262), resonates with the findings of my study. The authors list examples of support, including skilled curriculum coordinators, mentorship, and increased planning time (pp. 262-263). These supports require attention to a connected area of research – that of programming to educate the educators (coordinators, instructional coaches, mentors, and the like). As noted in the previous section (Faltis & Valdés, 2016), there is a gap in research examining these educators' understandings of content and language integration.

Varghese (2004, 2006) and Cahnmann, Rymes, and Souto-Manning (2005) have studied bilingual teacher education in terms of teacher experiences. Varghese's (2004, 2006) studies of the abovementioned nine-month institute was provided through a local university, federally funded, and in a state where there were no bilingual-specific licenses for bilingual teachers. Like in other states, teachers would become elementary or secondary certified, and then take a language test. The experiences of participants, who were provisionally certified bilingual teachers, highlight issues of teacher agency, as well as how professional identities are formed at the local level and interact with more broadly (and locally) circulating discourses of who "bilingual teachers" should be – advocates for language minority students, language policy creators, and/or – in the case of the instructors – information transmitters rather than collaborators in the creation of understandings. In a similar vein, Cahnmann, Rymes, and Souto-Manning (2005) pay specific attention to the cultural and political processes of bilingual teacher education in the United States, and their study examines student experiences during the program they co-planned and instructed. This program, the Teachers for English Language Learners (TELL) program, was a federally funded bilingual teacher recruitment program from 2003-2008, with the goal of "increas[ing] the number of critically minded bilingual educators" (p. 195) in Georgia. Cahnmann et al. are clear that, as instructors during this program, their goals for the participants were to be able "to define themselves as *both* bilingual adults *and* bilingual teachers" (p. 197) and to be able to resist "erasure of their bilingual identity when submersed in Georgia's traditionally monolingual schools" (pp. 196-197). Through their discourse-level examination of focus group conversations, one concern identified is that of "the corporatization of bilingualism" (p. 203). Much of their

participants' discussion circulated around Educational Testing System (ETS) Praxis exams, which were viewed by participants as a marker of English proficiency and "bilingualism" – to the extent that "local understandings of the bilingual skills needed for teachers, and careful conversations about what each of them needed to succeed in Georgia's bilingual classrooms, were underemphasized in favor of rankings generated by nationally produced, generic assessments" (p. 204). Findings of my study draw attention to some of these same broadly circulating and unfixed issues in bilingual teacher certification such as English-only licensure and evaluation exams, which "threaten local definitions and uses of bilingualism as a resource" (Cahnmann et al., (2005) p. 197).

More recently, Varghese and Snyder (2018) highlight similar experiences of pre-service teachers in a different program and different state, where students still were relegated to mainstream, English-medium instructional preparation in terms of coursework. Though they write that new departmental leadership offers promise for future programming specific to *bilingual* (both describing teachers and their instruction) teacher education, the on-the-ground education during student teaching was highly situational and subject to the cooperating teachers' individual situations. My study, building on this literature pertaining to teachers' experiences of bilingual education, serves as an additional example of the situational nature of school-site professional support. Even though, as is analyzed in Chapter 4, OUSD's English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA) office and Olmeda administration are clear about the importance of bilingualism and biliteracy, the placement of monolingual-English support staff influenced opportunities for teachers to grow in their capacity to teach toward bilingualism and biliteracy.

Bilingual teacher performance exams. In terms of literature related to exploring bilingual candidates' experiences with teacher performance assessments required for credentialing, as of this writing, only one publication (Kleyn, Lopez, & Makar, 2015) addresses bilingualism and teacher performance assessments. Kleyn et al. (2015) focus on planning a course that supported pre-service bilingual teacher candidates with the edTPA. In their self-study, the authors find that, as the edTPA does not specifically address bilingual instruction, teacher candidates (and their instructors) were limited by the exam to demonstrate their pedagogy – particularly around language-specific practices such as translanguaging. While there is limited research examining mainstream (English-only) candidates' focus on English Learners during the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT), this research (Bunch, Aguirre, & Téllez, 2009) does not reflect bilingual classrooms. No research has been published around the bilingual PACT. The PACT is now being phased out in favor of the edTPA and CalTPA (Lyn Scott, personal communication, March 10, 2019). While there is movement within the CCTC to support the writing of a majority of a CalTPA portfolio in any language, this movement is very recent, and as of the drafting of this dissertation, many details still need to be ironed out. Neither the edTPA nor the CalTPA have a "bilingual"-specific option.

A central component to "clearing" a preliminary credential in California is the passage of a teacher induction program – what in OUSD is called the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program – during the first five years of holding the preliminary credential. BTSA coaching of Sam and Sage, two of the early-career teachers in my study, turned out to be an important area of teacher support. During the current study, these two participants and Xiomara, their coach, considered the BTSA portfolio

assignment they were required to complete as a performance assessment like the PACT. Each of the three had completed the PACT during their preliminary credential programs, but none of them completed a bilingual PACT. The completion of Sage's BTSA portfolio in English, then, analyzed in Chapter 5 and discussed in Chapter 6, demonstrates how the power of a performance assessment perceived to be English-only continues to travel across time and space into school district and state requirements.

Bilingual Teacher Education: In Sum

"A teacher is the product of a full educational system that includes that teacher's home environment, community upbringing, K-12 education, experiences outside the community, higher education and finally the teacher education specific course work" (Wilson & Kawai'ae'a, 2007, p. 38). I posit that the language ideologies of all members of a bilingual school community are also a "product of a full educational system." The "product" is shaped only in part by the national or state standards of teacher preparation, or by experiences during teacher education. This holistic perspective must be better understood at the school and district levels in order to strengthen teacher practices via broadly-envisioned, systematized, early-career supports and continued professional development. While the studies cited above each have explored bilingual teacher experiences during pre- and in-service education, the researchers have not yet situated these experiences among dimensions of time, space, and power. My study examines bilingual teacher professional development at one school in a progressive district in a progressive area of a progressive state, where the three early-career participants experienced issues of English-medium professional development, along with gaps

between ideologies of their professional development leader, their required credential-clearing assignments, and their teaching colleagues at Olmeda Elementary.

The literature reviewed in this chapter, from KSAs of teachers in "linguistically diverse" classrooms to teacher and instructor experiences during pre- and in-service bilingual teacher education, point to a need for clear articulation and delineation of both goals and expectations of educational language policies. While researchers have examined various elements of bilingual teacher education and language policy enactment, this study is unique in its consideration of how dimensions of time, space, and power connect to an assemblage of a particular group of bilingual teachers, prepared during the same timeframe in California public universities that were held to the same program standards. Research into educational language policies is necessary to inform and inspire action toward social justice surrounding multilingualism in pK-12 education and society. By closely examining the experiences of early career teachers in one bilingual school site in "California's most diverse city" (the OUSD byline on all district press releases since July 2016), where many district and school employees share passionate commitments to social justice, this study requires a critical lens to examine the range of values and language ideologies that all study participants hold, to examine dimensions of power that influence facets of bilingual pedagogy and practices that are supported, and to examine individual experiences of moving from novice teacherhood to "clear" credentials. Though not the focus of this study, findings here show how, in one California district, state-level policy around BTSA was appropriated at the district and individual level, and how this appropriation muted both Spanish and the most novice teachers. While in agreement with Cammarata and Tedick's (2012) call for more targeted support of teachers in bilingual

settings, the tracing of bilingual teachers' experiences of these sorts of supports, as outlined through and connected with state or district policies, is an unexplored area of research.

Drawing from and building on critical language policy scholarship, particularly in terms of ethnographic language policy scholarship, in Chapter 3, I outline both the methodology and methods of my study. Neither CDA nor ethnography on their own can holistically capture what California's bilingual authorization "does" or how and why participants "do" bilingual education policy. Without a foundation of research on which to build, without a deeper understanding of the bilingual authorization and its direct and indirect connections among some of California's newest bilingual teachers, it is impossible to adhere to the critical orientation of this study, geared toward social change.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods of an Ethnography of Language Policy

It is my position that, in order to attempt to understand, as noted in Chapter 2 "why [things] happen the way they do" (Heller, 1999), it is essential to look for the multiple ways our actions connect to our belief systems and the structures that shape our trajectories of professional growth. These connections occur at different points in time, to varying degrees of proportion, and with varying consequences. In this chapter, I outline the methodology and methods that form the foundation of this study. I first describe how I combine critical social theory, ethnography of language policy, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), and a multidimensional heuristic to examine my research questions. Next, I provide an overview of the data sources, data collection, and data analysis. Finally, I establish the study's context, beginning broadly with a history of teacher credentialing and bilingual education in California and ending with an introduction OUSD and the study's participants.

Study Design

This ethnographic study of California's bilingual authorization aims to capture a multidimensional picture of an educational language policy text, how it circulates in written form, as well as the multiple ways in which it is understood in one school district; more specifically, in one bilingual elementary school among early-career bilingually authorized teachers. This study seeks to illuminate and elucidate early-career bilingual teachers' navigation of professional development, a "meso" level which arguably should be connected to the macro-level language policy being examined, in order to support bilingually authorized early-career teachers to become stronger *bilingual* teachers in their "micro" contexts. Specifically, this study examines the meanings teachers and individuals

in their support networks make of the policy itself as well as these teachers' experiences with school and district professional development.

These supports represent a practical connection to the bilingual authorization in that the three study participants were all early-career teachers who, at the time of the study, were still in the first years of credentialing. Two held preliminary credentials and were working toward clear credentials; one of the participants had not yet attained even a preliminary credential. Normative policy discourse, such as the bilingual authorization, "crucially presupposes an implicit view of how things are—a model of the world, an operative cosmology, as it were. Policy thus (a) defines reality, (b) orders behavior, and (sometimes) (c) allocates resources accordingly" (Levinson et al., 2009, p. 770). Combining critical discourse analytic methods with ethnography, heeding the critiques by Blommaert (2005), Hult (2010), and Johnson (2010), this study critically examines how, in California, bilingual education policy has "defined reality," "ordered behavior," and "allocated resources" for three early-career bilingually authorized teachers in one bilingual elementary school.

The design of this study is qualitative, with a focus on "process, meaning, and understanding" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 294). In the following section, I describe how I ground the study in critical social theory, from a stance that language ideologies undergird language policies, and in turn wield powerful influence on how these policies are appropriated at broad and local levels. Mere description of influence and appropriation is not sufficient; action in response to unjust results of policy appropriation must follow. While this study describes influence and appropriation of the bilingual authorization, specific suggestions to address points of injustice follow in Chapter 7.

Critical social theory. The theoretical framework for this study is grounded in critical social theory, which aims to "understand the unique ways that modern institutions employ 'knowledge' to manipulate 'identity' in the service of 'power'" (Levinson, 2001, p. 15), as well as "[help] practical actors deal with social change by helping them see beyond the immediacy of what is at any particular moment to conceptualize something of what could be" (Calhoun 1991, cited in Levinson, 2001, pp. 6-7). The "practical actors" I am writing for include members of the Oakland Unified community; as such, this study is both timely and hopefully useful to those working to build strong bilingual schools in Oakland and beyond. In terms of "critical," this study allies with critical scholars in a belief that social theory should be oriented toward critiquing and changing society and not simply to understanding or explaining it. This study examines, in local dimensions, how participants discursively represent their understandings of how bilingual education works. On what might be termed a macro level, it examines what ideologies of bilingual education are discursively constructed in state guidelines to prepare bilingual teachers for bilingual education.

Though the usage of macro/micro has been problematized in the literature (see Wortham, 2012), I use the terms here to represent the intention of reach of the policies: for state policy envisioned for millions involved in California schools and school districts, macro; for school district policy envisioned for local schools and communities, meso; for policies envisioned and experienced by teachers within their local classrooms and schools, micro. Most importantly in the construction of a holistic interpretation of a language policy, this study examines where these ideologies intersect, what kinds of ramifications they hold, and explores implications of these ramifications "beyond the

immediacy" of daily life in one bilingual elementary school. This study combines critical anthropological and sociocultural conceptualizations of educational policy, specifically, educational language policy.

Ethnography of language policy. "[T]exts are nothing without the human agents who act as interpretive conduits between the language policy levels" (Hornberger & Johnson, 2007, p. 528). Whether considering various metaphors or terminology to represent the multidimensional field of policy and appropriation, Hornberger and Johnson's statement endures, and forms a foundation of my choice to pursue this study via an ethnography of language policy approach. Ethnography analyzes "small phenomena…set against an analysis of big phenomena…in which both levels can only be understood in terms of the other" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 16). Though traditionally, ethnographers have sought to better understand a culture, ethnography of language policy research "seeks to uncover the cultural logic of language policies" (Tollefson, 2015, p. 188) – or, as Blommaert writes, "*how* language matters to people" (2005, p. 14). Ethnography of language policy considers policy itself "as a situated sociocultural process: the practices, ideologies, attitudes, and mechanisms that influence people's language choices in pervasive everyday ways" (McCarty, 2011, p. xii), and "seek[s] to describe and understand these complex processes and in particular, the power relations through which they are constructed" (McCarty, 2015, p. 82). Central to the decision to approach the research questions via an ethnography of language policy approach is the position that language policies are not "decontextualized objects"; rather, they "are part and parcel of the discursive social contexts of the societies for which they are crafted" (Hult, 2010, p. 9). McCarty (2015) describes ethnography as both "a *process* of

conducting research framed within a particular disciplinary tradition, and as a *product* – an account derived from that process" (p. 81). As McCarty writes, "a critical ethnographic perspective gets us a view into LPP processes in fine detail – up close and in practice – and the marbling of those processes as they merge and diverge, constantly configuring and being (re)configured within a larger sociocultural landscape, which they in turn (re)shape" (2011, p. 17).

As a co-worker at Olmeda Elementary, the use of ethnographic methods forms thick descriptions of the participants' understandings and navigation between state, district, and school-level attention to professional development and with the bilingual authorization. I thereby examine and interpret the discourses of bilingual teaching understood by and promoted by members of California's bilingual education language policy community. I move beyond descriptions of these understandings to interpret the socially-constructed understandings via a critical policy lens – i.e., one that seeks to expose and explain the manipulation of identity and power via promotion and planning of bilingual education.

Though later I discuss my choice of terminology "dimension" instead of "scale," this study aligns with what Eisenhart (2016) labels as "multi-scale ethnography," in its attempt to "identify and understand cultural forms that travel across spaces, levels, and times" (p. 1). Considering California's bilingual authorization as a textual representation of an idealized "culture" of bilingual education, I argue that critical examination of the interpretation and appropriation of this "ideal" should be undertaken, simultaneously, across macro, meso, and micro dimensions of this policy landscape. As, according to Eisenhart (2016), multi-scale ethnography "implies some form of spatial decenteredness"

(p. 4), looking at a policy's intersections among various dimensions acknowledges that no one dimension acts or is acted upon in isolation; ramifications of these actions ripple throughout California's broad language policy environment.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Aligned with Fairclough's (2001, 2007) position that, as ideological workings of language merit examination by those who study relationships of power in society, and as "discourse" is both determinant of and determined by social structures, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is essential to expose the ideologies of bilingualism in California's education policies. Fairclough (2007) concurs with Blommaert (2005) that CDA, used in combination with ethnography, strengthens social analysis. Central to the analysis in this study is the notion of "discourse" as it is used in CDA. This study employs Fairclough's (2001) model of discourse as having three interconnected dimensions: text, interaction, and social context. A text must be considered both as a product that carries ideological "traces of the productive process" as well as "cues in the process of interpretation" (2001, p. 20). Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) therefore must consider examining "the relationship between texts, processes, and their social conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situation context and the more remote conditions of the institutional and social structures" (p. 21). Faircloughian CDA suggests three stages of analysis: description (of the text), interpretation (of the text as both product and as cue to how people read the text), and explanation of the social context and how it both affects and is affected by interaction with the text (pp. 20-22). I follow these three stages throughout Chapters 4-6; Chapters 4 and 5 focus primarily on text analysis and interpretation of multiple data sources (described in detail below), and Chapter 6 on text explanation.

> Johnson (2010) lists the utility of CDA in language policy research, in that (1) its attention to the various layers of context in which a text is produced and interpreted lines up well with the multiple layers of context through which language policies must pass; (2) its focus on discourse and power explains how language policies, and societal discourses, can hegemonically sculpt language education toward monolingual practices; and (3) while CDA recognizes the power of macro discourses, it allows for counter-discourses (and thus counter-discoursers who interpret and appropriate language policies in agentive ways). (p. 64)

As such, CDA provides a useful way to connect the bilingual authorization, whose text resides in California law, to various institutional and individual practices – and examine closely how these practices connect to dimensions of power and ideologies of language.

"Discourse analysis should result in a heightened awareness of hidden power dimensions and its effects: a *critical language awareness*, a sensitivity for discourse as subject to power and inequality" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 33). This study seeks, via a combination of ethnography and CDA, to examine the nuances of power, interpretation, and resistance to multiple, circulating discourses around bilingualism in education. Some effects of power, such as the absence of formal consideration by the State, District, or Olmeda Elementary, of coaching or support of Melisa because she did not yet hold an initial credential, are evident to all eyes. CDA, combined with ethnographic observations, collected over a course of extended time, illuminates the broader web of policy language, including institutional and individual interpretation of this language, that both strengthens a call for state-wide systemic change in this area, as well as draws attention to the

structures against which participants push back. In addition, when examined among dimensions of time, space, and power, CDA allows a more holistic contextualization of the individual stories told by study participants.

Data Sources and Collection

Procedure. As an ethnography of language policy, this study draws upon traditional forms of ethnography – participant observation, field notes, document analysis, and interviews. Over the course of 13 weeks in March–June 2017, I audio recorded weekly professional development meetings (PDs) and monthly staff meetings, in which I also participated as a school employee. I also recorded eight Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings, of which I also was a member, and five coaching sessions of each of the study participants who received beginning teacher support and assessment (BTSA) coaching. Each of the three early-career study participants audio-recorded reflections after each weekly PD and coaching session. In addition, I conducted semi-structured interviews with these participants and with key district and school figures in their support network. Further, I examined multiple documents produced by the CCTC pertaining to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that preliminarily and clearly credentialed teachers should hold; *Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Standards, Preconditions for California Educator Preparation Programs, The Committee on Accreditation's Annual Accreditation Report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2014-2015*. I also surveyed *Multiple Subject and Single Subject Induction Program Standards, Teacher Induction Program Preconditions and Program Standards,* and OUSD's *Roadmap to ELL Achievement, 2015-2016-End of Year One Report.* In addition, I examined OUSD's publicly-viewable Google drive folder on all

things BTSA for the 2016-2017 school year. This includes coaching and portfolio/assignment resources, district bulletins, enrollment information. Finally, as is detailed in Chapter 4, I closely analyzed the two primary documents pertaining to California's bilingual authorization; *CL-628B*, which is the six-page "credential leaflet" that a person interested in earning the bilingual authorization follows, and *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards*, the most recent (2015) support manual to guide EPPs through accreditation to offer a bilingual authorization. See Table 1, below, for an overview and timeline of data collected, as well as the application of data collected to each research question.

Table 1

Data Collection Overview and Timeline

Research Question	Domain	Data collected	Collection dates
1. How are the language ideologies that circulate around California's elementary teaching credential authorizing bilingual instruction produced and interpreted at multiple scales of policy development and implementation?	State-Level	California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Documents: CL-628B, *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards* accreditation handbook, Coded Correspondences 98-9805, 04-0001, 10-22, *Teacher Induction Program Preconditions and Program Standards* Interviews: Direct questions of all interviewees as to their understanding of the bilingual authorization	2/2017-9/2017
2. How do these ideologies [and language	School District-Level	Documents: OUSD Roadmap to ELL achievement and website	2/2017-9/2017

orientations] intersect with professional development for early career teachers in one local schooling context, and what are the ramifications of these intersections?		description of DL: http://www.ousd.org/Page/15094 Interviews: ELLMA (English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement) director, dual language program specialist, science grant coordinator, BTSA manager	
a. How does a school district that hosts bilingual schools interpret professional growth for multiple subject (i.e. elementary teacher) bilingual authorization holders who teach in bilingual schools?	Elementary School-Level	Documents: Those pertaining to school-level decisions about professional development planning and other teacher support, including agendas, notetakers, handouts, and slideshows	2/2017-6/2017
		Participant observation/audio recordings: Weekly PD sessions, ILT meetings	2/2017-6/2017
b. How does an individual bilingual elementary school interpret professional growth for bilingual teachers?		Interviews: Principal, BTSA coaches, literacy coach	

c. How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?	Classroom Teacher-Level	Participant observation/audio recordings: BTSA 1-1 coaching sessions, teacher audio reflections of these coaching sessions, teacher audio reflections of PD sessions Interviews: Semi-structured interviews of each teacher participant	2/2017-6/2017

> An ethnographic approach is both emic and holistic:
>
> emic in that the ethnographer attempts to infer the local point of view: to describe the ways of being, knowing, and doing, and situations and events, as members understand and participate in them, i.e., as they make sense of them. It is holistic in that the ethnographer seeks to create a whole picture, one that leaves nothing unaccounted for and that reveals the interrelatedness of all the component parts. Crucial to ethnography is the subjective involvement of the ethnographer in mediating between theory and data; and crucial to achieving a holistic and emic view are the processes of inference, interpretation, and induction. (Hornberger, 2015, p. 16)

As a co-worker at Olmeda, an emic, subjective position was a challenging stance to navigate, as I was already living the culture of the school in one sense. To achieve a holistic view, however, I needed to shift from collegial observation to participant

observation. Data collection took place during my second year of employment at the site, during and outside of my own school responsibilities. During participant observation of PDs and ILT meetings, I also participated as a staff member. I took notes as we proceeded in meetings but was as careful as I could be that my primary role during these meetings was as employee and colleague. I attempted to balance this data collection with voice memos on my way home from school, or with quick write-ups before I left for home. Data analysis relied heavily on my listening to the multiple audio recordings of all the meetings I attended and participated in, as well as my own transcription of the meetings. Sage and I began at Olmeda the same year, Sam was one year newer than I, and Melisa, though employed for more years at the site, was in her first year teaching during the data collection period. Wayne entered his role a few months after I did; our positions were funded essentially for the same time period. My position as both a colleague and "invader… of a certain sort, picking up and putting down facts and feelings of others, while simultaneously reflecting on [my] own memories and ideas" (Heath & Street, 2011, p. 29) became more comfortable as the weeks progressed – perhaps because of relaxation around data entry, but also perhaps because, during the data collection period, we learned that my position for a third year at Olmeda had been defunded. In other words, participants and I wouldn't need to think about how we would renegotiate our school-based relationships "back" once the study was over.

I transcribed 50 hours of meetings, interviews, and participant self-reflections using a singular voice-recognition (i.e., my voice only) web-based program called Wreally. Grateful for the advances of voice-activated software in terms of time saved, I became even more grateful of the power of repeating every word that all participants

voiced. In terms of transcription, as I collected audio transcripts only, I followed standard conventions (Bucholtz, 2000; DeFina, 2009; King & Punti, 2012), while also considering, especially at the school level, interviews as interactional events (Talmy, 2011). Due to final time constraints, I contracted out transcription of eight hours of BTSA coaching sessions (at which I was present), four ILT meetings, and one staff PD, but still listened to each session while reading the transcript in order to ensure accuracy and to interact again with the meetings.

All transcriptions and documents collected at the school site (field notes, PD handouts, ILT agendas) were uploaded into Dedoose. After pre-coding as I collected data, for tentative connections to research questions, I then conducted a broad initial round of structural and values coding (Saldaña, 2016), as "values" provided a structure for looking at language planning orientations. The first round of coding was line-by-line, and yielded 221 codes and subcodes. Perhaps inefficiently, if following Saldaña's guidance, I coded everything – not just "the most essential parts of [my] data corpus" (2016, p. 79). This dissertation study has been a slow-to-complete object of work that has occurred outside my daily full-time job; as such, I needed to be able to see patterns of description as well as know that, by returning to codes, I was sure to return to all parts of my data corpus. Between the first and second cycle of coding, I added Fairclough's "text/interaction/context" CDA model into my coding scheme. In this way, I began to consider more closely the social conditions and processes of text production and interpretation, as related to participants' contexts. As such, I was able to begin to organize connections among data excerpts and hierarchical assignations; assignations that, for example, were frequently the case between English and Spanish. As is the

iterative nature of the study, I moved back and forth between transcripts, codes, and analytic memos, looking for patterns and "*co-occurrences* [that lie] at the heart of the *constant comparative* ethos and approach of ethnographers" (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 41). I chose to analyze state documents outside Dedoose and performed this analysis between the first and second round of coding. During the second cycle, codes were subsequently reorganized, categorized, and refined according to their patterns. I then returned to the data, searching for themes and patterned regularities, arriving inductively at the findings that guide the organization of Chapters 4 and 5. Only after arriving at the findings addressed in Chapters 4 and 5, did I add dimensions of space, time, and/or power to the excerpts that inform Chapter 6. To add these dimensions, I drew more heavily on interviews and observations, especially as connected to the "pervasive everyday ways" (McCarty, 2011, p. xii) that situated the bilingual authorization as socially constructed and reproduced. As an ethnography of the bilingual authorization, this final organization of findings draws together how I understand the ways that participants appropriate an educational language policy. This "way of seeing" (Wolcott, 2008) is only complete as a critical language policy study when drawing attention to how dimensions of power shape participants' direct and indirect interactions with the policy itself.

In accordance with IRB, all recordings were stored in a password-protected Cloud account, along with double password-protected Dedoose. All participants except myself, OUSD, and Nicole Knight were given pseudonyms. Because I am a district employee, my affiliation is publicly available, and as Nicole is the executive director of the ELLMA office, she recognized the futility of anonymity. All participant descriptions were agreed to by each, and data from interviews, observations, and field notes were cross-analyzed

and member checked with study participants prior to finalizing findings. Triangulation of multiple kinds of data, along with member checking, lends credibility to these interpretations I make (Patton, 2002). Each participant brought their own unique history to their positions, and I endeavored to give adequate representation of these experiences without speaking "for" anyone. I am very conscious of my own position as a White teacher and researcher moving in racialized spaces and hope that, via member checks, triangulation, and support from my dissertation committee, I represented each participant's voice appropriately. This dissertation is a labor of love; beyond the clear professional and ethical requirements of research, these participants and OUSD are my professional home and community, and I took special care to capture their words and experiences reliably, with integrity and thoughtfulness.

Positionality. At the time of the study, I had worked in bilingual elementary schools for ten years and had moved back and forth between classroom instruction and program coordination. As a professional educator, I am familiar with various complexities that arise between policies, their intended goals, and their school-level enactment. Returning to the classroom after finishing doctoral coursework deepened my interest in examining schools within a broader sociocultural, critical frame. Because of my own relatively new position in the district (beginning research halfway through my second year in OUSD), while collecting data, I felt that I straddled a line between being an insider and an outsider - though my own classroom was based inside the same school, my position was somewhat outside the realm - I was the first and only person at this site to hold the position of Newcomer Teacher on Special Assignment (TSA), and my entrée did not quite fit the mold of traditional jobs at Olmeda Elementary. Further, more than 50

percent of the students I worked with came from a neighboring school, located on the same campus – yet my staff affiliation was solely with Olmeda. In addition to working with newcomers, I provided instructional support to teachers at both schools in terms of English Language Development (ELD, a state and district term) instruction. I supported Sage daily during half of her first year at Olmeda, and I briefly supported Sam during the fall 2016. Though this "extra" in-class time in teachers' rooms provided a clearer picture of teacher practices, the focus of my study is not on performance per se – it is on teachers' interpretations of the bilingual authorization. Throughout the weeks of the study, I strove to maintain a clear line of separation between my "day job" as a co-worker and teacher, and my role as a researcher. If anything, I hope that any additional time I spent building trusting, non-evaluative relationships with Sage, Sam, and Melisa helped to relax any initial concerns about participating in this study. Both in terms of data collection and analysis, I was transparent and cautious about what I was recording and later analyzing, and I relied on member checks to help me better understand what the data showed and what it did not show.

The theories that frame this study are critical social theories. I approach this study from the stance as a White woman who, because of a Bachelor's Degree in French and because of my daily use of (non-academic) Spanish, has been labeled sometimes as bilingual, sometimes as multilingual. Though my OUSD students (all "newcomer," most of whom are from Central America) and I are aware of challenges we navigate to understand each other, I have no doubt that my ethnicity and status as "teacher" add extra imagined Spanish proficiency to these labels. I recognize the privilege from which I approach multilingualism, as though I am by all accounts an immigrant rights activist,

word nerd, and continual student of languages and language education, I have come to my place among multilingual communities entirely by choice. As such, even with thoughtful data collection, analysis, and reflection upon my positionality, I recognize that my study reflects only what participants were willing, consciously or unconsciously, to let me see. The participants in this study are my colleagues and professional community, and my study is designed in part to offer the field a well-supported perspective on what new bilingual teachers need in order to continue in the profession. As a career-long educator, I did not complete this study solely as a requirement to finish a Ph.D.; my interests in improving the field are professionally personal.

Limitations. Often education policies may be dismissed by classroom teachers as top-down directives coming from people who "have no idea what it's really like." In the case of the particular language policy I examine, drafters of bilingual authorization program guidelines include faculty at schools of education with bilingual authorizations. Arguably, these authors really do "know what it's like." Certainly, school and district-level participants retain close proximity to the classroom. It may be "difficult, perhaps impossible, to ascertain authorial intentions – in part because it is impossible to document all of its thousand sources of culture" (Johnson, 2015, p. 169), but if a methodological approach assumes a sociocultural way of being that is always interacting with what has come before and what will come after, then exploring authorial intention via some sort of historical approach is as important as examining the structure of authors' written text. As I was unable to enlist in my data collection any of the drafters of the bilingual authorization program standards, nor find any CCTC authors of CL-628B, as it currently

stands, this holistic picture, from my perspective, may be silencing many important voices.

Other limitations to this study include typical and foreseen limitations, which were identified to and acknowledged by study participants, and approved by both the University of Minnesota's IRB and OUSD's review board: that of possible breach of participant identity. I have made considerable efforts to maintain anonymity of participants and have obscured identities to the extent possible, but because of the public nature of my own employment at the research site, it is impossible to guarantee complete anonymity for all participants. Another potential limitation, due to the close nature of our elementary school community, involved the inability to maintain anonymity of participation within the school site. There is an obvious and acknowledged hierarchical employment relationship between teachers and the principal, and this was openly acknowledged in the consent acquisition process and during interviews. The principal, in signing a consent form, acknowledged the practical concerns that arise around the ability to speak freely about professional needs of the teachers. As one of the stated potential benefits of the study is articulation of early-career teachers' needs, any expression of these needs was consented to be met with professionalism.

In addition, I would be remiss not to mention three unexpected events that shaped the course of my data collection; first, the defunding (post 2016-17) of my position at Olmeda; second, the hospitalization and death of my father and my time out of state in order to attend to this; third, an unanticipated facial injury. Once data collection began, I was absent as an employee for a total of 10 days – yet I came to school after hours to participate in and observe PDs, ILT meetings, and interviews. Though impossible to

account for how study participants reacted to my own accumulation of a series of unfortunate events, including an obvious facial laceration that temporarily prevented muscular movements, such as smiles, that are natural parts of communication, these events made *more* visible to me the varied depths of subjectivity – from how people respond to visible cues such as physical anomalies, to how they respond to loss and grief. These limitations do not detract from the significance of this study, nor I believe to its validity; though the surprises that came during data collection were indeed unexpected, they served as reminders that we as humans are always acting and reacting to the events of life-writ-large. Sometimes these events are invisible, sometimes not.

Data Analysis

In addition to tools of Faircloughian CDA described above, I used two frames to analyze and interpret data collected: 1) language ideologies and language planning orientations, and 2) dimensions of intersection of time, space, and power. These approaches are connected to the study design in important ways. First, as California's bilingual authorization represents language planning of bilingual education, it is crucial to exhume the ideologies and planning orientations at its base. Second, tracing ideologies and language planning orientations through district and school dimensions requires a heuristic for identifying points of intersection across time, space, and power. Building on the work of scholars exploring local appropriation of state, federal, and global education policies, I looked for ways these connections could be conceptualized across multiple dimensions of time, space, and power.

Language ideologies and language planning orientations. I explored what language ideologies were produced and by whom, through what semiotic and social

processes they were communicated, and how they were interpreted by and for early-career bilingual teachers. To do this, I used Ruiz' (1984, 2010) notions of language planning orientations, as connected to study participants' representations of language ideologies, or "the intersection language and human beings in a social world" (Woolard, 1998). During data analysis, I struggled for some time with Ruiz' three orientations, unsure if my employment of CDA was revealing a "language-as-problem" orientation or "language-as-resource" orientation. Didn't the mere existence of an authorization represent the acknowledgment that education in more than one language is something to be valued? The prominence of English, however, in the bilingual authorization text, examined closely in Chapter 4, left me unsure that California was promoting languages *other* than English as a resource. I read and reread Ruiz' essays and scholars' work using these orientations. I used Hult and Hornberger's (2016) table "(Pre)dispositions in the Orientations to Language Planning" as a sort of checklist to see if ticking boxes in one column would amount to a final assignation of either "problem" or "resource." I was left unconvinced. Finally, in an attempt to name this gray area of policy language that left an unsettled feeling, I built on other scholars' work (de Jong et al., 2016; Lo Bianco, 2001) to expand the "resource" nature of Ruiz' orientations. As discussed in Chapter 4, I labeled California's orientation to bilingual education as a "language-as-problematic resource."

Multidimensional points of intersection. "The fundamental challenge to ethnographers is to lay out *what is happening.*" (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 35). This section describes the system I use to explain my arrangement of "what is happening" with a language policy. Building on scholars' work to represent context – the multiple,

dynamic points of reference that shape knowledge and action – I analyzed the data for this study using a heuristic of a multidimensional model of language policy. As "any text [both written and spoken] is a link in a chain of texts, reacting to, drawing in, and transforming other texts" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 233, on intertextuality), crucial to understanding the unique experiences of early-career bilingual teachers in one school, is the recognition that, assuming intertextual ways of being, both a written policy and individual interpretations are discursively shaped by prior policies and experiences. Additionally, policies and the people who interact with them exert varying levels of influence upon each other. This study explores how participants interact with California bilingual language policies in education. Intersections of policy and practice necessarily must account for various individual experiences, while also remaining situated within the broader site of bilingual education in Oakland, in California, and in the United States. In this section I argue that a multidimensional analysis of space, time, and power is needed in order to more fully interpret an educational policy.

Bartlett and Vavrus (2014, 2017) propose framing of policy-as-practice along vertical, horizontal, and transversal assemblages: "The transversal element reminds us to study across and through levels to explore how globalizing processes intersect and interconnect people and policies that come into focus at different scales" (p. 131). Thus, the idea of a third perspective captures the interconnected, uneven, and at times unjust pieces of the act of drafting, revising, publishing, and interpreting California's bilingual authorization. Attention to layers of context in which a text is interpreted must draw in part on experiences of text producers, interpreters, and re-producers. Therefore, an attempt to place historical elements of California's bilingual authorization creation in

relationship to study participants' interpretation and appropriation strengthens an assembly of a multidimensional model of a language policy. Blommaert (2005) writes that the movement of people across space is never a move across empty spaces. All "space" is always someone else's too, and therefore filled with norms, expectations, and conceptions of what counts as proper (indexical) language use as well as what does not count as such. Placing legislative history related to bilingual education in California during the last 25 years alongside participants' experiences in Olmeda, Oakland Unified, and other spaces, a more nuanced story of an educational language policy is captured with an additional dimension of interpretation. Bartlett and Vavrus (2017) propose comparative case study research using horizontal, vertical, and transversal comparison of space, scale, and history. Building on their call, which draws on Ball (2016), for new ways to study interconnections of policies and people interacting with them, I propose an ethnography of language policy that considers dimensions of power, space, and time. This moves away from axes and angles into a metaphor of policy appropriation that represents the "grittiness" and "unevenness" of policy work. Underlying these dimensions is ideology – of language, language planning, and multilingualism.

A multidimensional model of language policy illuminates both to researchers and to those involved in educational language policy on the ground some of the ways we are connected to each other. The small and big phenomena Blommaert (2005) refers to may be measured in different ways, depending on the goal of the analyst. In this language policy study, I posit that small phenomena, such as one teacher's experiences in one school in California, are inseparable from policies crafted at a state or district level and, as Blommaert writes, both are needed in order to understand either. In this *critical*

language policy study, I argue that the uneven outcomes of early-career teachers' professional growth are connected both to the ideologies and orientations underlying the bilingual authorization, and that the gaps of justice amplify different dimensions of California's bilingual education policyscape. Our actions have consequences that ripple out or are filtered through in response, and policy writers as well as policy appropriators are better served if they can be more thoroughly informed of the broader picture.

Research Site and Participants

California. California is a state of superlatives. Aside from being the state with the largest population (approximately 39.5 million in 2017), it is also the state with the largest labeled Hispanic population (15.3 million), the first state (in 2014) whose labeled Hispanic population outnumbered any other racial or ethnic group, the state with the oldest bilingual teaching credential (1973), the largest number of K-12 students (6.2 million), and the largest number of children labeled as English learners (21%, though many more have been "reclassified" as English-proficient and speak languages in addition to English) (CCTC, 2011; California Department of Education, 2018; ED.gov, 2018; Pew Research Center, 2017; Stepler & Lopez, 2016; U.S. Census, 2018).

Overview of California teaching credentials and education preparation programs. An overview of elementary teacher preparation in California, and more specifically, bilingual elementary teacher preparation, provides a backdrop to this study. What follows is a brief history of California's standards as they pertain to elementary licensure and to EPP accreditation, as well as a summary of how California's bilingual authorization fits into the broader arena of standards and licensure in the state.

To date, the seal of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC)

includes the phrase "since 1970." A history of contemporary licensure in California therefore begins at this date. The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 (commonly known as the Ryan Act) established the current governance structure for California credentialing. It introduced five "new" principles, two of which are relevant here. First, the Ryan Act "created an independent licensing agency, the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing [later renamed the Commission on Teacher Credentialing], composed primarily of educators to oversee the professional preparation and certification of all educators. This was the first agency of its kind in the country" (CCTC, 2011, p. 144). Second, the Ryan Act launched the still-used monikers of the general education credentials[5] issued to pK-12 teachers: "multiple subject" and "single subject." Because most elementary classrooms are self-contained, most people planning to teach in elementary classrooms pursue a multiple subject credential. The Ryan Act also mandated state-level education policy involvement of school employees; today the 15 voting CCTC members, appointed by the governor for four-year terms, include six classroom teachers, one school administrator, one school board member, one school counselor or services credential holder, one higher education faculty member from an institution for teacher education, and four public members.

In 1973, one year before the Supreme Court would issue its landmark verdict on Lau v. Nichols, and the same year that the Ninth Circuit Court was upholding a ruling dismissing San Francisco Unified School District's responsibility for "bilingual compensatory education in the English language" to non-English speaking Chinese-

[5] In California, teachers are credentialed, not licensed.

speaking students (U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, 1973; U.S. Supreme Court, 1974), the Bilingual/Crosscultural Teacher Training Act (S.B. 1355) was passed. In May 1973, California became the first state in the U.S. to adopt guidelines for a bilingual credential, called the Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Credential. By June 1976, 14 multiple subject and single subject teacher preparation programs (of the 204 CCTC-approved programs of professional preparation in the state) had a bilingual/crosscultural emphasis (CCTC, 2011, p. 166). Today there is no longer a credential specific to bilingual teaching, and teachers/candidates add a bilingual authorization onto a multiple or single subject credential. California currently accredits 78 college/university multiple subject credential programs, 30 of which offer bilingual authorization programming. The following languages are currently represented: ASL, Arabic, Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. Only the Spanish authorization is offered as part of all 30 accredited EPPs' programming.

California's current credentialing and EPP accreditation structures are products of reforms mandated by SB 2042, legislation passed in 1998 that broadly revised teacher preparation in the state. Two outcomes in particular pertain to this study's context; first, whereas prior to SB 2042, an English Learner (EL) authorization was an optional addition to a general education credential (requiring extra hours of EL-specific preparation), SB 2042 mandated that all basic teaching licenses be revised to include this authorization – thereby establishing policy that acknowledged the prevalence of California students who speak languages other than/in addition to English and establishing expectations that every teacher be skilled in theories and practices to support

their acquisition of academic English. However, the inclusion of coursework into essentially the same expected timeframe of the former credential program meant, to many, an erosion or dilution of what had previously been considered a strong preparation for working with English Learners[6].

1998 also saw the passage of Proposition 227, the "English Language in Public Schools" statute. With 227's requirement that English Learners be taught via sheltered or structured English immersion (SEI) if their parents did not opt out of SEI to opt *in* to a bilingual classroom, many bilingual classrooms around the state closed, and monolingual classrooms absorbed this linguistic diversity. From March 1998 to March 2004, the number of students labeled as English Learners who were in bilingual classrooms where academic subjects were taught in their primary language declined from 408,879 to 126,546, a decrease of almost 70% (Montaño et al., 2005). During the next decade, the proportion of EL-labeled students in K-12 bilingual programs decreased from 30% in 1998, to 5%, and many EPPs discontinued their bilingual authorization programs (CCTC, 2015b; Koseff, 2016). Arguments surrounding the Proposition 227 ballot initiative were prevalent for many months prior to the June 1998 election, and likely influenced individual thinking during the legislative hearings around SB 2042. More recently, California voters essentially revoked Proposition 227 via the November 2016 passage of Proposition 58.

[6] Though excited about the current growing movement to shift from "English Learner/EL" to "Emergent Bilingual," I use the former throughout this dissertation to maintain consistency with past and current usage in OUSD and California written policies.

The second SB 2042 outcome relevant to this context is California's legal recognition – and requirement – that new teachers develop into more skilled professionals as they gain experience.[7] The state's tiered credential system is such that newly credentialed teachers are issued a preliminary credential, which is valid for five years and is nonrenewable. During the ensuing five years, teachers must complete a CCTC-approved induction program, typically the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System (BTSA) induction program, which includes two years of intensive support and mentoring. California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs, to which pre-licensure candidates are held) represent the beginning progression of California's Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Credentialed teachers are held to the CSTP, both for receiving and renewing a clear credential.

Though not a focus of this study, it is useful to note that a third requirement of SB 2042 was the establishment of a teaching performance assessment requirement for all candidates in EPPs leading to a preliminary teaching credential; these performance assessments have since influenced teacher education nationwide. In California, EPPs may structure their performance assessment requirement as it best suits their programs, constructing their own "embedded signature assessments"; most are scored locally. Students do not just receive a score: "Consistent with statute, Commission-approved Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) assess candidate performance relative to the TPEs and must provide TPE-based feedback to candidates to help strengthen their teaching practice" (CCTC, July 8, 2016). Currently four different performance

[7] §44259(c)(2)

assessments are approved by the California Committee on Accreditation (COA), for use: The California Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA, developed by the state along with ETS, and about to undergo revision), the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT, developed by a consortium of initially 12, now 30, institutions), the edTPA (developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity - SCALE), and the Fresno Assessment of Teachers (FAST, developed by California State University-Fresno for use at their campus). All TPAs should measure the candidate's performance on California's TPEs[8] and the tasks are completed during the teacher preparation program.

In addition to a TPA, all teaching candidates in California must pass a basic skills requirement – California accreditation requires that students attempt an exam before admission to an EPP; some programs require passing scores while others allow program entry irrespective of the initial basic skills exam results. However, before taking daily responsibility for whole-class instruction in student teaching in California classrooms, candidates must verify (in English only) basic skills competency via one of six exams. A snapshot of passing rates of the most frequently-used exam to meet this requirement, the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) follows in the next section. Multiple subject credential seekers must pass additional exams as well: the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) and the three California Subject Exams for Teachers (CSET). For individuals planning to teach bilingually in California elementary schools,

[8] As the edTPA rubrics stand, in use in other states, language in the rubrics is not explicitly linked to California TPEs. I was unable to find access to specific information about edTPA local scoring, planning, and programming.

California-prepared teachers must complete a bilingual authorization program either during or after completing a "2042" credential program. It is also necessary to pass up to three additional CSET exams: one that assesses target language proficiency (waived if candidates meet other proficiency markers), one that assesses knowledge of bilingual methodology, and one that assesses "bilingual cultural knowledge."

Accreditation of EPPs offering a bilingual authorization. California's COA and the first *Accreditation Framework* were outcomes of Senate Bills 148 and 655, in 1988 and 1993, that sought to "create a professional accreditation and certification system that would contribute to excellence in California public education well into the 21st Century" (CCTC, n.d.a). The CCTC states, "the major purpose of state accreditation of educator preparation programs is to assure that those who teach and provide a variety of education-related services in the public schools have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective educators" (CCTC, 2016a, p. 1). Further, additional purposes of EPP accreditation in California are to assure the public that EPPs are "high quality…effective…accountable… Accreditation provides the means for programs to continuously improve based on evidence of candidate outcomes, program effectiveness, and on feedback from ongoing peer review processes" (p. 1). The CCTC appoints the 12 members of its COA, which oversees California's accreditation of EPPs. The COA also negotiates the alignment between national standards and California accreditation standards. According to the CCTC, each member of the COA is "carefully selected from a pool of distinguished educators [and] embodies the expertise, experiences, and commitment envisioned by the writers of the Accreditation Framework" (CCTC, n.d.a). Half of the members are expected to come from public and private postsecondary

administrators and faculty members who are involved in educator preparation programs; half of the members are expected to come, certified, from the public K-12 school system. COA members are appointed to a four-year term, and may be re-appointed once. *Framework* language makes clear statements about efforts to ensure representation from a broad pool of California educators:

> To the maximum extent possible, Committee membership is balanced according to ethnicity, gender, geographic regions and across credentials awarded by the Commission. The Committee includes members from the public K-12 school system and from public and private postsecondary institutions. The elementary and secondary school members include certificated administrators, teachers, and at least one member involved in a professional educator preparation program. The postsecondary members include administrators and faculty members, all of whom must be involved in professional educator preparation programs. (2016a, p. 9)

In California, EPPs must be state-accredited, and can opt to pursue national accreditation. First and foremost, according to the *Framework*, is that the national accrediting body must agree to use California's Common Standards of accreditation. California holds the CCTC (not a national accreditor) responsible both for initial program approval as well as continuing program review.

California's accreditation process moves on a seven-year cycle. Many steps are required. Prior to renewing (or applying for initial accreditation), EPPs must first meet CCTC compliance-related preconditions. This includes 10 general institutional preconditions, four general program-specific preconditions and, for EPPs providing bilingual authorizations, three additional specialist preconditions. These 17 preconditions,

based either on state law or Commission policy, include (specifically for bilingual authorization) the requirement that elementary bilingual authorization candidates hold (or be simultaneously recommended for) multiple subject or education specialist credentials (or the equivalent), including the authorization to teach English Learners (as required by SB 2042). In addition, for bilingual authorization candidates already holding a credential, prior to enrolling in an intern program delivery model, language proficiency standards must be met (CCTC, 2015d, p. 22).

After preconditions are met, EPPs offering a bilingual authorization must demonstrate compliance with two additional sets of standards: the five Common Standards and six Program Standards. Meeting Common Standards is required of every California EPP. Specific articulation of candidate knowledge and skills remains program-specific, and for a bilingual authorization program, is published in an additional handbook, the *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards*. Adopted in 2009 and revised in 2015, these six Program Standards include 1) program design; 2) assessment of candidate competence; 3) the context for bilingual education and bilingualism; 4) bilingual methodology; 5) culture of emphasis; and 6) assessment of candidate language competence. In terms of program design, the handbook states that

> curriculum is designed around the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for Bilingual Methodology and Culture. It provides candidates with a depth of knowledge regarding current research-based theories and research in academic and content literacy in two languages, building upon both SB 2042 and California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) competencies. (CCTC, 2015b, p. 10)

SB 2042 did not, in fact, include any language specific to bilingual teacher preparation standards, even though bilingual authorization (and instruction) was (and continued to be) actively occurring state-wide. While SB 2042 revised all credentials to incorporate English Learner authorizations into multiple or single subject credentials, the status of any revisions to the bilingual authorization was unclear, and the pre-2042 authorization was to remain active until the CCTC could convene an advisory panel to address revising bilingual teacher preparation program standards. First convened in 2005 by the CCTC, seven years after SB 2042 passed, a working group, later named the Bilingual Certification Design Team, began to examine bilingual education policy issues as they related to SB 2042. The *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards* is the written product of the Bilingual Certification Design Team; prior to SB 2042, standards for multiple-subject, single-subject, and "emphasis" programs were compiled into one handbook.

Standards of teaching performance/practice. Because California teacher education preparation providers must be accredited by the state, California teachers prepared during the same time period at California-accredited institutions arguably have met the same expectations regarding required knowledge, skills, and abilities of bilingual teachers. To earn a preliminary credential, California teaching candidates must meet the state's teaching performance expectations (TPEs). The TPEs, updated in 2013 to ensure alignment with the California Common Core State Standards, were revised again and adopted June 16, 2016 (CCTC, July 8, 2016). These standards now align with California's six Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), which must be met to earn a clear credential. Where previously there were 13 TPEs, now there are six: 1)

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning; 2) Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning; 3) Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning; 4) Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students; 5) Assessing Students for Learning; and 6) Developing as a Professional Educator. Perhaps most notable in the context of this study is the removal of TPE 7: Teaching English Learners, which has been subsumed in the new TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning. The COA is careful to write that "[t]he numbering and order of the six TPEs do not indicate relative importance or value; all TPEs are considered equally important and valuable." (2016d, p. 7).

Assessment of bilingual authorization teacher candidates. California's most recent report available for review at the time of this study (February 2014) on passing rates from 2008 through 2013 of CCTC-approved exams includes data on CSET exams, including bilingual authorization exams, as well as data on CBEST results. The report states that more than 250,000 examinees have taken single and multiple subject exams since the 2003 launch of CSET exams; 55% took the multiple subjects exams (p. 14). In the report, the purpose of the bilingual authorization exams is described as such: "the CSET: World Languages Bilingual-Specific subtests is for candidates to demonstrate they have the level of knowledge and skills required to effectively teach English learners and other students in bilingual classroom settings" (p. 29). The CSET Subtest IV: Bilingual Education and Bilingualism states:

> This test covers foundations of bilingual education; bilingualism and biliteracy; intercultural communication and culturally inclusive instruction; school, home, and community collaboration; language and literacy instruction and assessment in

bilingual education settings; content instruction and assessment in bilingual education settings; and evaluation, use, and augmentation of materials in bilingual education settings. Subtest 4 is in English, does not focus on any specific language, and consists of 50 multiple-choice questions. (p. 29)

CSET Subtest V: Bilingual Culture, is described as:

> There are multiple versions of this subtest, each focusing on a specific culture. Each version covers the following for the target population: the geographic and demographic contexts; the historical context; the sociopolitical context; the sociocultural context; and crosscultural, intercultural, and intracultural contexts. Each version is in English and consists of either 50 multiple-choice questions or five constructed response questions, based on the target culture. Candidates may respond in English or in the target language. (p. 30)

As might be surmised, examinees test in the target language for CSET Subtest III, which assesses language proficiency. The report does not provide isolated pass rates for Subtests IV or V, but does include the combined number of exams administered for V (in Spanish culture only) and for IV.[9] For each subtest, between 2008 and 2013, numbers fluctuate slightly. The average rate of administration for Subtest IV across the years is 460. The average rate of administration for Subtest V in Spanish is 429. The report includes pass rates for Spanish Bilingual cohorts taking all three exams, and includes a breakdown of passing rates based on ethnicity. The 2003-2013 cumulative passing rate on these three exams for Spanish Bilingual cohorts is 64.6%. Two issues stand out from

[9] If the total number of tests administered annually is under 50, they aren't reported. This may explain the Spanish-only numbers here.

these numbers. First, in a state that issued 7,546 preliminary multiple subject areas in 2010-11 alone, there would appear to be much room in bilingual classrooms for far more than the approximately 400 bilingual examinees. In addition, the passing rate for self-identified White candidates: 78.1%, compared to self-identified Hispanic American candidates: 60.1%, of examinees toward a Spanish bilingual authorization, merits closer attention. BTSA coach Julia Garza's comments about her own experience testing are included in the participant descriptions that follow.

Olmeda Elementary, within Oakland Unified. In a different sort of superlative, California hosts many of the most expensive housing markets in the country. Olmeda Elementary stands in a part of "Deep East" Oakland that, due in part to decades of a high crime reputation and perhaps also to current streetscapes of garbage piles and stripped vehicles, has been slower than many neighborhoods to gentrify. Oakland recently won the dubious honor of being one of the three most competitive housing markets in the U.S., and in November 2017, the current median listing price for a two-bedroom home had risen to $535,000. However, two-bedroom homes in Olmeda's single family home-filled neighborhood, one of the closest to a major freeway heading to Silicon Valley, were valued at $371,000 at the end of 2017. At the time of this study, families of Olmeda students were not buying into this neighborhood, to be sure, and the market rate's monthly rent for two-bedroom homes had almost doubled over seven years, from $1312 to $2497 (still a "bargain" compared to Oakland's city-wide $3075/month). It is impossible to underestimate the influences that affordable housing availability for students and staff, alongside the district's budget woes, continue play on the short-term and long-term psyches of the OUSD community. Though not a focal point of this study, I

must acknowledge this (extra) collective weight many in Oakland carry with them throughout their days. While the Bay Area's housing crisis extends beyond Oakland, specific to this study, OUSD's management of fiscal resources during a budget freeze did directly influence support of early-career teachers during the period of data collection. Though the removal of funding for my position did not directly impact coaching of any study participants, the concurrent funding and defunding of Wayne's instructional coach position and my position, which included supporting teachers' English Language Development (ELD) instruction, meant that for two years, two extra faculty were able to support teachers who taught in English; these positions then dissolved.

Oakland Unified also uses a superlative to describe its setting. At the bottom of each press release from the district is this descriptor: "In California's most diverse city, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) is dedicated to creating a learning environment where '*Every Student Thrives!*' More than half of our students speak a non-English language at home. And each of our 86 schools is staffed with talented individuals uniting around a common set of values: Students First, Equity, Excellence, Integrity, Cultural Responsiveness, and Joy. We are committed to preparing all students for college, career and community success." (OUSD, n.d.a). During Spring 2017, the period of this study, OUSD hosted six dual language Spanish-English elementary programs and was working to expand into a second middle school program. OUSD's ELLMA department actively maintained a web page on the benefits of dual language programming and was phasing out transitional bilingual programming to better align with a clear pro-biliteracy and pro-multilingualism stance (OUSD, n.d.b).

Olmeda enrollment statistics appear to match developmental bilingual education rather than dual language –as connected to two-way programming; Olmeda was labeled dual language and the administration hoped eventually to balance linguistically the ratio of children who speak Spanish more proficiently and those who speak English more proficiently. Historical neighborhood demographics had been such that the vast majority of Olmeda students arrived at school speaking Spanish more proficiently than English. (See Table 2, below.) The school (and district) however, were working to grow enrollment of students designated as "English-only" or "IFEP" (Initial Fluent English Proficient – students who check a "language-other-than-English-spoken-at-home" box on enrollment, and thereby are assessed at a high enough level English proficiency via the CA English Language Development Test (formerly CELDT, now ELPAC). During the 2016-17 school year, 83.1% of Olmeda students were labeled (via initial and/or yearly monitoring by the CELDT) as English Learner – compared to 7.1% school-wide who enrolled as English-only or "sufficiently" bilingual to test as IFEP. By fourth grade, about a quarter of students tested high enough to be "reclassified" (RFEP) into the non-English-Learner population, and by fifth grade, an additional six percent reclassified. At Olmeda, there was a palpable energy around promoting reclassification and the school held award ceremonies to honor those students who met the criteria to reclassify. This strong reclassification rate added to Olmeda's reputation as a strong bilingual school in Oakland; one where teachers and administration were deeply committed as well as skilled. Many of the school's former principals have gone on to district-level leadership positions.

Table 2

Olmeda Elementary Student Languages, 2016-2017

Home Language: Spanish	Home Language: Mam	Home Language: English	English Only	IFEP	RFEP	EL[10]
311	6	20	20	4	32	280

At the time of the study, Olmeda was the only OUSD dual language elementary that listed, for hiring purposes, all their classroom teaching positions as bilingual positions – regardless whether individual teachers taught in both Spanish and English, or in only one of the languages. During the 2016-2017 school year, all but one of the classroom teachers held some form of credential authorizing instruction in Spanish[11]. Because upper grades divided the day evenly between English and Spanish, it was possible for one teacher to teach two groups of students in only one language. This was the case during the period of data collection. All the Transitional Kindergarten-second grade teachers taught in both Spanish and English, but most third through fifth grade teachers shared students, with one teacher teaching primarily in English and one primarily in Spanish.

Filling open positions in OUSD is an annual event. Between 2007 and 2017, district-wide, the teacher retention rate averaged 82.7%, with 76.3% of teachers returning to their sites for a second year. However, these numbers drop at the site level when looking at retention of teachers beyond three years. Over the same 10-year span, district-

[10] One student was marked "TBD" in terms of English proficiency.
[11] I was not employed as a "classroom teacher" at Olmeda and do not hold a bilingual authorization.

wide, the site-based retention rate for teachers staying more than three years dropped to 52.8% (OUSD, 2018). Aggregated, the site-based retention rate for teachers staying at any of the six dual-language elementaries for a second year was 75.3%; for more than three years was 52.7%. Olmeda Elementary faculty mirrored these statistics; an average of 75.8% of teachers returned for a second year, and 59% stayed beyond three years. During the study, of those 59% who had stayed at Olmeda beyond three years, five had been at the school for over ten years. In addition, the principal had begun teaching at Olmeda in 2003, moving into the administrative position in 2013. Of the 124 teachers that were employed at the six dual-language elementary sites, 41, or approximately one-third, held preliminary credentials, emergency credentials, or intern permits during the 2016-2017 academic year. Intern permits and emergency credentials are short-term, temporary options for those seeking a preliminary teaching credential. Of the three early career teachers in this study, two held preliminary credentials and one held an intern permit. At Olmeda, only the "least novice" of the three types of credentials – preliminary holders – received district-mandated BTSA support. The "most novice-but-employable" teacher, Melisa, held an intern permit. Though logic would dictate that she receive at least as much coaching as the preliminarily credentialed teachers, she in fact was assigned no coach. Further discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, resources to support early-career teachers are not evenly distributed among holders of different "novice" credentials.

Study Participants. Table 3 summarizes the types of data collected involving each of the individual study participants and provides a visual reference as to how teachers and their support network in Olmeda Elementary and OUSD were connected. A description of each participant follows.

Table 3

Study Participants, Domain of Work, and Data Collected

Domain	Participant	Data Collected
School District-Level	Nicole Knight, ELLMA Executive Director Alice Holst, New Teacher Support Manager	One semi-structured interview of each
Dual Language School-Level	Madeleine Benjamin, Principal Wayne Allen, Literacy Coach Xiomara Guerrero, BTSA Coach Julia Garza, BTSA Coach	Observation data: Weekly school PD sessions, twice monthly Instructional Leadership Team meetings, BTSA coaching sessions One or two semi-structured interviews of each support person
Classroom Teacher-Level	Sam Christensen, Fifth Grade Teacher (in English) Sage Kearny, Second Grade Teacher (in Spanish and English) Melisa Muñoz, Fourth Grade Teacher (in Spanish and English)	Observation data: Weekly school PD sessions and BTSA coaching sessions Two semi-structured interviews of teacher Collection of audio reflections post-PD and BTSA sessions

Primary Participants: Early-career teachers.

Sage Kearney, 2nd Grade Teacher (Spanish and English). Sage Kearney, a self-described straight, White, cis woman and native Californian from a working-class background, started learning Spanish in high school on the eastern side of the Sierra. She labeled herself as being "decent in Spanish" back then, passing the AP exam and placing

third in the state on a competitive Spanish exam. While in college, she studied abroad in Mexico and in Spain; post-graduation, she worked in Mexico for six months. Before enrolling at San Francisco State University's credential program, where she earned a multiple-subject teaching credential with a bilingual authorization in Spanish, Sage had already completed a Master's degree in education and worked in community education and immigrant rights settings both in San Francisco and the East Bay (where, geographically, Oakland is located). Like many, she was drawn to the Bay Area for its progressive politics and activist communities, of which she was part. Upon completing her credential program, Sage – "Ms. K" – was hired at Olmeda to teach second grade, in both Spanish and English. During the time of this study, she was in her second year of teaching.

Sam Christensen, 5th Grade Teacher (English). Sam Christensen came to Olmeda after one year of teaching fourth grade in a bilingual classroom in a nearby district. In many ways, Sam gave the stereotypical impression of being the White boy-next-door. He was tall, lanky, and soft spoken, yet blasted classic rock in his classroom after students left, drove a Ford pickup, and was active in his church's youth group. Having grown up in the South Bay, Sam attended California State University, Chico, where he became interested in bilingual education while majoring in liberal studies and Spanish. Like Sage, Sam began studying Spanish in high school. However, his Spanish had been acquired solely in academic settings – four years of high school and four years of college-level Spanish. At the time of the study, Sam had never travelled outside the United States. He spoke Spanish primarily within the elementary schools where he had taught. His teaching

assignment at Olmeda was teaching 100% in English; with many parents of his students, however, Spanish was the preferred language of communication.

Melisa Muñoz, 4th Grade Teacher (Spanish). Melisa Muñoz was in her first year of teaching on a provisional internship permit (PIP). She had not yet completed final requirements for her credential program at California State University, Stanislaus. While at Stan State, Melisa had pursued a multiple subject teaching credential without a bilingual authorization. It was not until she became a permanent substitute teacher at Olmeda two years prior to taking over a classroom that she considered bilingual education as a career. Melisa was born in southern California to parents who immigrated to the U.S. from Colombia. The only participant of the three early-career teachers who grew up bilingually, Melisa had many clear memories tied to each language. She grew up speaking Spanish at home and was in bilingual classes through second grade. She remembered third grade as being suddenly entirely in English. As Melisa was in third grade just after the passage of Proposition 227, California's "English Only" mandate, the switch to all-English may have been an outcome of legislation – though she had no recollection of how the law impacted her classes. In her words,

> those three years [of bilingual classrooms] were mainly Spanish and then I think that kind of like screwed me up, because I couldn't, I'm pretty sure we had [an English language proficiency] test back then, because I couldn't pass something and I was in ELD classes until 8th grade. And it was ridiculous.

In high school, Melisa took Spanish classes, but tested out after a year and a half. Throughout her childhood, Melisa's parents made sure she continued to read and write in Spanish, and she stated, "I loved Spanish. I had a really hard time transitioning into

English. I was a very low reader in third grade. I was put in after-school classes and all of this because, like, my English was just so low." With an education history of testing and remediation in English, perhaps it was inevitable that, throughout the study, our conversations always returned to Melisa's worries about being able to pass California credential exams, one of which she had already failed four times before finally passing on the fifth attempt (post data-collection).

The support network: School-based support.

Xiomara Guerrero, Teacher Leader and BTSA Coach. Self-confidence and a fiery energy radiated from Xiomara Guerrero – literally. She kept the air conditioning on in her classroom year-round, and was unapologetic about expecting students and colleagues to take care of making sure their own needs were met in response to the low temperature. Xiomara was thorough, efficient, and worked at a pace that humbled me. She began teaching at Olmeda in 2010. Like Melisa, she began as an intern. Though teaching two classes entirely in English during the period of this study, Xiomara began by teaching at Olmeda when the school maintained a higher percentage of English in upper grades (90%), so first taught in English and Spanish. During her first two years as an intern, Xiomara taught full-time and was enrolled across the Bay in San Francisco State's bilingual authorization-credential program. Like Sage, she came into the classroom already holding a Master's degree in education equity and social justice. She recalled her first years at Olmeda as such:

> [F]or me it wasn't like the biggest challenge. I have so many years background already in education that it was very natural to me to be in the classroom and I didn't feel overwhelmed, like having to go to school after. I'm a super organized

> person and I was super lucky and so I think this has everything to do with it, to walk into a functioning team in the 3rd grade. So I had two experienced veteran teachers who basically handed me what to do on a weekly basis which made my life very easy.

One of those veteran teachers was Julia Garza (described below) who also coached Sage through the majority of her two years of BTSA. By her fourth year of teaching, Xiomara had already been tapped by the district as one to support in leadership, and she completed the district's Emerging Leaders program in 2015.

Xiomara, who described herself as a Chicana, grew up in southern California. Born to a first-generation Mexican-American father whose first language was Spanish and a third-generation bilingual Californian mother, she was in bilingual classrooms in Kindergarten and first grade, but then moved schools. Her new school had no bilingual strand, and she laughed as she remembered being placed into ESL at that school even though she

> didn't really speak Spanish. And I was in it for a long time because I didn't tell anybody and no one told my parents. So that was the situation…I thought it was incredible because I got to be with, like other kids who were like me and who looked like me, which there weren't very many, you know, at my school specifically. And we got to do really easy things and I wasn't the smartest cookie in the batch, and we got to go on field trips so I was like 'winning' like MAJOR wins.

When she was in high school, Xiomara, in her words, "decided it was totally unacceptable" that she could not communicate with her Spanish-speaking grandmother,

and began studying Spanish. She continued her studies in college and studied abroad during two summers – one in Spain and one in Mexico.

Wayne Allen, Teacher Leader and Instructional Coach. Olmeda's reading scores (in English) earned the school extra literacy support during the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years. Wayne was hired to coach faculty on literacy instruction and particularly to support the school's new adoption of Lucy Calkins' Readers' and Writers' Workshop curriculum. A native New Yorker and long-time elementary teacher in a high-performing Manhattan public school, Wayne received notice that his "clear" California multiple subject teaching credential was issued during the time of this study. Though he held a permanent certificate in New York, Wayne was required to take 11 credits of coursework specific to working with English Learners (the CLAD – Crosscultural Language and Academic Development) before he could earn a clear credential in California. Wayne had previously worked primarily with students who spoke English as a first (often only) language. He spoke only English, and at the time of the study, was the only Olmeda staff member[12] who was not bi- or multilingual – though three other faculty, including myself, did not hold bilingual authorizations.

When asked about the applicability of the CLAD course work to his position in Oakland, Wayne said,

> every reading I did, every assignment I did, was - oh my gosh reminded me of a kid or a group I had or a teacher's classroom or something, or just talking to a parent. It was remarkable to me how often I was reflecting on my work here and I

[12] Cafeteria and custodial employees are excepted in this statement, not because they are monolingual (some clearly speak multiple languages); only because I never inquired.

> think if I was in, you know [a more affluent area where he had formerly worked], it would have been a very different experience and the learning would not have been as deep. So I do feel like it was influencing me all the way through. Really heavily influencing me and helping me reflect.

Though it was easy for me as a co-worker to dismiss Wayne for lacking language skills and social justice goals I personally rank as non-negotiable when working with emergent bilinguals, and though he may not always have acted aware of the privileges that he carries, Wayne was a genuinely reflective and thoughtful professional. He was also the only Olmeda employee involved in the study who did not earn his preliminary teaching credential in a California institution of higher education. Interestingly, in this state that represents movement and migration for millions, the network of teachers and supports in this Oakland school were almost exclusively products of California's public K-16 system.

Madeleine Benjamin, Principal. Madeleine Benjamin, Olmeda's principal, is a White woman who was raised in San Francisco. From a family of public educators, she had been teaching since she graduated from the California State University system. Her BA was from California State University East Bay, her multiple subject teaching credential was earned through San Francisco State, and her bilingual authorization was earned through San Diego State. Between finishing her multiple subject teaching credential and starting her teaching career in California, Madeleine taught English in Costa Rica for one and a half years.

Upon her return to the U.S., mid-academic year, she was hired as a long-term substitute in a dual language school. There, she became interested in dual language education, and realized the benefits of holding a bilingual authorization. She completed

the authorization the following summer via a study abroad program in Mexico, and taught for a year in South San Francisco in a school that was, as she describes, a "pretty big mismatch" for her. She recounts that she struggled to the extent that she began to doubt her decision ever to become a teacher. This early experience is one that has remained with Ms. Benjamin – as an employee (not a researcher), I heard the story at least two times during my two years at the school. In addition, during data collection, Madeleine recounted this experience during our interviews. Madeleine searched for a different position among Spanish-speaking bilingual programs and was hired at Olmeda. OUSD's reputation seems to precede it, no matter the era, and Madeleine remembered that when she started at Olmeda in 2003, she "was advised not to come here. No one speaks well of Oakland as a district." However, she was the first to talk about how fully supported she was by the principal at the time, as well as by the district:

> In Oakland I've had tremendous amount of opportunity to refine my craft… within the school but even better, outside of the school. When we had money, we got to go to conferences... and the on-site coaching … [the principal] was pretty good about getting into me weekly, and I felt like that really took me, like, to the next level; that extra skillful set of eyes in the classroom really helped me. I was already doing well; I was already pretty good, but he came in and he pushed me and I made huge growth I think as an instructor, and it was super helpful.

Madeleine moved into the principal role for the 2014-2015 year, and was in her third year of administration during the time of this study.

Julia Garza: BTSA Coach. Like Xiomara, Julia came to Olmeda as an intern. She was a member of Oakland Teaching Fellows, a recruitment program that hired new

teachers on intern permits and provided supports while they were enrolled in a credential program. Julia taught third grade at Olmeda from 2008-2014, when she was asked to fill the school's TSA position (what other schools might call Assistant Principal). Julia, who has dual citizenship in Mexico and the U.S., was raised bilingually, and educated in both the U.S. and Mexico (in monolingual programs in each country). She recalled that all the classes she took at San Francisco State for the bilingual authorization were in English. She said, "It was odd to me. I guess because, like, many of the people who were getting the BCLAD did not really speak Spanish. It was kind of weird. You know. It's just, you feel like you're going to teach them in Span... none of my classes are in Spanish. Which was unfortunate." The only exam she remembered having to take to earn the BCLAD was a Spanish exam administered by the university. She called this exam her first encounter with "not equitable education" because the Spanish on the exam was Castilian Spanish.

Julia received official and unofficial coaching during her first four years at Olmeda. During the first year, Oakland Fellows provided a mentor, and her fellow veteran grade-level teacher also voluntarily "unofficially" coached Julia during the two years she was enrolled in her credential program. Once Julia had a preliminary credential, this same colleague became her BTSA coach for two years. She stated, "I feel like that was one of the main reasons why I still, I stayed." Julia earned her clear credential in 2013 and participated in OUSD's leadership academy and moved to a district-level position during the 2016-2017 school year. She remained Sage's BTSA coach, as she had been so the previous year. Julia went on maternity leave when data collection began, and

Xiomara took her place. Julia's information is included primarily as background to Sage's and Xiomara's references to her during the BTSA process.

The support network: District-based support.

Alice Holst, Manager, New Teacher Support. At the time of this study, Alice Holst managed the district's office of new teacher support. A White career educator of more than 30 years, Alice first held this manager position in 2002 for many years; she then returned to it in 2015. Alice holds multiple clear California teaching credentials – administrative services, multiple-subject, single subject in art, and a CLAD. She taught for many years – both art and elementary grades (first grade, second grade, third grade, 2/3 combination, 3/4 combination, and fourth grade, all in Oakland). Alice had been involved in teacher preparation and induction for multiple years, both in OUSD and with a local institute that offered teaching and administrative credentials.

Nicole Knight, Executive Director, OUSD English Language Learners and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA) Office. At the time of the study, Nicole Knight had been with OUSD for over 20 years. She holds several California teaching credentials – a multiple subject credential, single subjects in both History and English Language Arts, a BCLAD, and an administrative credential. Nicole lived in Brazil for several years and speaks Portuguese as well as Spanish. A veteran and visionary administrator who had grown the ELLMA department from an office of one into an office of 17, Nicole was familiar with multiple forces at play in education policy. During her tenure at ELLMA, she had enlisted OUSD and members of Stanford's Understanding Language team to strengthen the district's support of English Learners – including moving to end transitional bilingual programs in favor of building bilingualism and biliteracy.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have outlined how this ethnography of language policy is designed from a foundation of critical policy studies and Critical Discourse Analysis. By using tools of CDA combined with ethnographic data collection and analysis, this study looks closely at how an educational language policy drafted at a state level intersects with teachers on individual professional levels. Conceptualizing these interactions across multiple dimensions of time, space, and power, a weaving together of both ethnographic claims and text analysis makes visible to stakeholders involved in all dimensions of bilingual education how language education, teacher education, and policy work are connected.

My research questions probe ideologies of the bilingual authorization as it is written into policy, along with bilingual teacher professional development. Chapters 4-6 are organized in order of the research questions. Chapter 4 examines ideological "common-sense assumptions" of both the bilingual authorization and BTSA policy language, and situates the state-crafted texts within the context of OUSD and Olmeda teachers. While the macro-level text indexed primarily the role of bilingual education as a (problematic) resource to learn English, meso and micro-level positions offered, to use Johnson's (2010) language, "counter-discourses." Chapter 5 ethnographically situates the experiences of early career teachers and their support network within micro-, meso-, and macro-dimensions of ideologies of language, professional development, and the BTSA process. Wayne, facilitator of the school's weekly professional development, was the staff member newest to bilingual education, the only monolingual faculty member, and one of three faculty members who did not speak Spanish. While committed to Olmeda

teacher growth, his skill set did not contain tools necessary to facilitate professional development around issues pertaining to bilingualism and biliteracy; he concentrated, therefore, on English language and literacy. This focus on English impacted the opportunities teachers who taught in Spanish had to grow professionally in their language of instruction. Further, the power of English was revealed during Sage and Xiomara's default to English during BTSA assignments, even when instruction being analyzed took place in Spanish. Chapter 6 examines, in particular, "power in discourse" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 36) of the bilingual authorization text, Olmeda professional development meetings, and BTSA coaching sessions. Following Fairclough's suggestion that any given excerpt of discourse can "simultaneously be a part of a situational struggle, an institutional struggle, and a societal struggle" (2001, pp. 58-59), the power in and behind discourses leading to these struggles varies at different dimensions of time and space. Therefore, in Chapter 6, I illustrate and discuss points of intersection of these struggles within dimensions of time, space, and power.

Chapter 4: Ideologies of and Orientations to Bilingual Teaching in California

This chapter addresses the study's first research question: "How are the language ideologies that circulate around California's elementary teacher credential authorizing bilingual instruction produced and interpreted at multiple scales of policy development and implementation?" Findings illustrate that divergent ideologies of bilingualism circulate in multiple dimensions of the field of bilingual education in California. The State's public-facing documents, containing language directly from the California Code of Reference, point to a position that bilingual education serves primarily as a resource for English acquisition. I call this a language-as-problematic-resource orientation and discuss this terminology further in a following section of Chapter 4. Within state accreditation guidelines, written by CCTC committee members to accredit EPPs offering the bilingual authorization, there is evidence that challenges this orientation. While the legislature has produced a particular language planning orientation, CCTC members, more closely affiliated with bilingual education, have subtly contested this orientation – at times. Similarly, local participants in this study with backgrounds in bilingual education disagreed with the language-as-problematic-resource orientations produced by the State. Local participants without backgrounds specific to bilingual education interpreted the State language somewhat differently.

In the first part of this chapter, attending to Fairclough's (2001) three dimensions of discourse, I examine the text of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) bilingual authorization leaflet, Credential Leaflet (CL)-628B. Fairclough's three dimensions of discourse are text, interaction with the text (via processes of production and/or interpretation), and context (via social conditions of production and/or

interpretation). By tracing some of the history of the bilingual authorization text via the 2015 bilingual authorization program accreditation handbook and four CCTC correspondence memos dated 1998, 2004, 2010, and 2017, I offer a description of how and what language is used to reference bilingual education, how the texts are organized, and what social events are represented. Via the CCTC memos, called coded correspondences, I look at how the State represents the production of the bilingual authorization. In doing so, I explore underlying ideologies of bilingualism circulating at the state level in California. In the second section of this chapter, I examine participants' responses in interviews to questions about CL-628B, and place these interpretations in relationship to each other, within staff and faculty at Olmeda, and within the broader OUSD network of school and teacher supports. In this way, I explore text interaction and context. The final section of this chapter concentrates on a brief examination of state and district teacher induction (BTSA) documents, alongside the district's New Teacher Support manager's comments about the bilingual authorization, as it became clear during data collection that, for Sam and Sage, BTSA coaching was the most concentrated and consistent support they received. Thus, I focus on both context and explanation – Fairclough's third dimensions of discourse and discourse analysis to illustrate how the social conditions of interpretation, i.e., contextual understandings of both the BTSA assignments and the bilingual authorization, directly connect to the power English is perceived to hold over other languages and language speakers. Collectively, these findings point to complications of policy appropriation in "real time." While actors at different dimensions of California's bilingual education arena are challenging a language-as-problematic-resource for English acquisition to language-as-resource for bilingualism,

they are currently held to a policy text that reproduces narrow ideologies of mono- and multilingualism.

Ideologies of the Bilingual Authorization: The State

CL-628B. When searching online for information about how to obtain a bilingual authorization in the state of California, the first link that appears in a Google search of "bilingual authorization California" is a PDF produced by the CCTC. This leaflet, Credential Leaflet (CL)-628B, provides an overview of the bilingual authorization, as well as a detailed description of all requirements that need to be met to apply for the authorization. CL-628B (CCTC, 2014) is the primary focus of document analysis in this study, as it is the public face of bilingual teacher preparation in California. CL-628B represents the State's articulation of bilingual education and the stipulations by which teachers must demonstrate their skills and capacity to teach in alignment with the State requirements. Close critical analysis concentrates on the first page of the leaflet, as this is the page that both describes and defines the bilingual authorization and is the page that I asked participants to concentrate on during interviews. Page 1 of CL-628B is attached in Appendix A. Though amended in May 2017, study participants were shown what was at the time the most recent version, updated in July 2014.[13]

Copyediting matters. Attending to the formal properties of the text, what Fairclough calls the first, or "description" dimension of CDA, I begin with the layout. A 1/8-inch black frame (1/4-inch along the bottom) outlines each page of the document. The margins are justified, and a color logo (red, orange, and white) of the CCTC is

[13] None of the text differences between the two versions occur on the first page; the 2017 changes occur at the end of the document.

embedded in the center bottom of the frame on the 2014 version. The seal of the CCTC (which encompasses the state seal of California), in the upper left-hand corner, is blue and golden yellow (the state colors of California). Study participants were shown a black-and-white printed copy. At the top of the first page, centered, is the letterhead; Line 1, State of California; Line 2, Commission on Teacher Credentialing. These two lines are both the same size, and in bold print. The following four lines of the letterhead comprise the street, email, and website addresses of the CCTC, and are smaller in font. With respect to layout, the titles of each section heading appear in a font distinct from the text itself-and distinct from the letterhead. Text appears to be in Times New Roman or a similar font, while the letterhead, document title, and subheadings appear to be in two other fonts. The footer appears in a fourth font. The title of the document, BILINGUAL AUTHORIZATIONS, is all in capital letters as well as bolded. The three section headings on the first page – Types of Instruction to English Learners Authorized by the Bilingual authorization, Definitions of Types of Instruction, Authorization, are also bolded. Aside from the names atop the letterhead, these are the only words that are in bold font on the first page. As the "State of California" oversees this document, literally and visually on the paper, the classification scheme represented in this informational document belongs to the State, a large bureaucracy that must, by definition, delineate rules and procedures for millions of people. Cohesive features, which for Fairclough can be "any formal feature of a text which has a cohesive function, which cues a connection between one sentence and another" (2001, p. 109) of the first page include the aforementioned headings, bullets, and line spacing to signal order and importance. It is also directive and pointed in terms of bullet use, connoting (van Leeuwen, 2005b) rules

and order. In addition, the state seal and use of bold fonts reinforce the normalcy of hierarchical relationships, ordering importance via extra concentrations of ink and symbols that promote the role of the government, the rule of law, and bureaucracy. Following van Leeuwen (2005a), this additional multimodal survey of the composition of the page, in other words the typographic features and visual images of CL-628B, when included with analysis of the text itself, shows how readers of CL-628B may interact with this document from a position of following procedure.

Considering, à la Fairclough, the interactional dimension of discourse (along with the interpretational phase of CDA), this study considers CL-628B as both a product of the *process* of production, as well as a clue as to how people will read the text. As such, while the state seal and letterhead connote authority and order, the multiple fonts stand out as distractions and suggest that close attention to editing for cohesion in this document is lacking. The multiple fonts appear as potential markers of an assemblage of different authors, or text from different places that has been copied and pasted into the current form. Further examination of coded correspondence memos, discussed below, along with inconsistent capitalization on subsequent pages of CL-628B, strengthen this impression. In terms of interaction with text, these visual cues suggest that the production of CL-628B is likely not the work of an individual or group (such as the Bilingual Certification Design Committee) that has spent careful attention on articulating the authorization for its seeker; nor has much thought been given to how readers might interact with the text itself. Beyond typography, this indication is reinforced in the wording of the text.

The first sentence below the title of CL-628B begins "Bilingual Authorizations allow holders to provide instruction to English Learners (EL)." In the first paragraph, authorization is made plural three times. Except for one additional pluralization of authorization on page 3, on page 1, **the** bilingual authorization (at times capitalized and at times not), is used two times (14 times total throughout the document), **a** bilingual authorization is used two times (11 times total), and **an** bilingual authorization is used once. Similar inconsistencies hold true for the capitalization of the phrases English Learners/English learners English Language Development/English L(l)anguage development, and Primary Language Development/Primary language development when referencing the same subject or object. The first heading: "Types of Instruction to English Learners Authorized by the Bilingual authorization" wherein "authorization" is not made uppercase, exemplifies the capitalization inconsistencies. The most generous interpretation of variable references to the object of the document suggests distracted or rushed assemblage.

This document displays its last revision as July 2014. AB1871, which legislated the change from BCLAD to "bilingual authorization" is cited as the legislation behind the document. AB 1871 took effect in 2008. This signals that at least four, but perhaps up to nine, years have passed without grammatical errors or inconsistencies in conventions being corrected. Older versions of the document are no longer available at the CCTC's website to trace revisions over time. However, regardless of language in earlier versions, the State has not performed basic edits to professionalize this important information to its audience, most of whom are likely prospective or current education professionals. All elementary teachers who teach any form of writing (i.e., all self-contained teachers)

include proofreading as part of the writing process, and the lack of proofreading of this document leads to questions about how much time and attention was allotted to its drafting, revising, and editing. "Context," for Fairclough, includes both social conditions of production and interpretation. As the production of the text itself indicates lack of close attention to the document, concerns arise about close attention to the bilingual authorization itself. In terms of contextual interpretation, the people who are likely reading and rereading this document are seekers of the bilingual authorization, as well as those who are working in EPPs that offer the bilingual authorization. Questions therefore arise as to how much *seekers* of a bilingual authorization are valued by the State. Though perhaps inconsistencies can be missed or overlooked on first glance, the more one interacts with a text, the more errors stand out. The people who must reread this document multiple times are the people who must adhere the most closely to its rules. This leaflet, produced by the California's regulator of teachers (and therefore positioned as more powerful than teachers themselves), signals an incongruity between a standard of work expected of the CCTC and that of a standard of work expected of people seeking its regulatory approval.

Authorization authority. The first two sentences of CL-628B read as such:

> Bilingual Authorizations allow the holders to provide instruction to English Learners (EL[*sic*]). Assembly Bill (AB) 1871, signed by the Governor on September 30, 2008, provides for the issuance of bilingual authorizations rather than certificates, and expanded the options available to meet the requirements for the Bilingual Authorization. (CCTC, 2014)

The first sentence provides straightforward information via a simple subject-verb-object structure. However, the verb "allow" is causative, which points to authority being vested in a policy – the Bilingual Authorization – and not in the CCTC, i.e., the State, which in fact is the entity that "allows holders to provide instruction." In contrast, the text of AB 1871, cited in this excerpt, begins as follows: "The commission shall issue an authorization for a teacher to provide all of the following services to limited-English-proficient pupils…" (CAL Edu. Code §44253.3). Whereas the legislature names the authorizer, the wording of CL-628B obfuscates the role of the agent of power (the State) in the granting of permission to join a profession. The drafter(s) of this portion of CL-628B did not copy California's education code. As will be highlighted further in this chapter, the locus of "authorization" vested in a document and not in the State appears in multiple memos drafted by the CCTC. The use of "authorization" in California contrasts with many other states that instead use "endorsement," a word that connotes support and trust rather than permission and oversight. In the second sentence of CL-628B, the invocation of the nameless Governor's authority furthers the individual anonymity of actors of the State, while at the same time references the value placed on the highest ranked state official. "Teachers" are not named as actors in the document. In fact, outside the usage of the name of the CCTC, the words "teacher" or "teachers" appear only four times among the 2035 words in this document. Fairclough (2001, 2003) would label teachers "patients" acted upon by the State. Bilingual Authorizations allow "the holders to provide instruction," silencing "teachers" as agents of this instruction. California's Education Code, CCR Title V, uses the same language, silencing teachers while identifying "holders." While the choice to use the word "holder" instead of "teacher" may

be deliberate in order to account for authorizing all types of California credentials, from the perspective of teachers, this word choice maintains a clear separation between elected officials determining education policy, the CCTC, and classroom teachers. This separation remains apparent when discussing credentials during participant interviews.

After the first paragraph, under the section heading, "Types of Instruction to English Learners Authorized by the Bilingual authorization," four domains of instruction, formatted as bulleted phrases, follow. The first two refer to language instruction; the last two to content instruction. This order contrasts to the order in the California Code of Regulations (CCR); an order (and wording) that has remained unchanged throughout the documents examined in this study – i.e., since at least 1998. CCR, Title V, § 80015.2(b) pertains to the CLAD/English Learner authorization and CCR, Title V, § 80015.2 (c) pertains to the bilingual authorization. CCR orders the four domains as such: 1) English language development, 2) content in English via SDAIE, 3) content in students' primary language, 4) primary language development. CL-628B orders the domains as follows: 1) English language development, 2) primary language development, 3) content in English via SDAIE, 4) content in students' primary language. In these phrases, the consistent ordering of English before "primary" languages visually reinforces the hierarchy of English, and the use of "primary" maintains the domain of bilingual education to English "Learners" only. These four phrases are defined in CL-628B:

> Instruction for …(ELD) means instruction designed specifically for EL students to develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English…also known as… (ESL) or… (TESOL). Instruction for *primary language development* means instruction for EL students to develop their

> listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in their primary language… (SDAIE) means instruction in a subject area delivered in English that is specially designed to provide EL students with access to the curriculum. *Content Instruction Delivered in the Primary Language* means instruction for EL students in a subject area delivered in the students' primary language". (CCTC, 2014, p. 1)

Language as a problematic resource. Ideologies, following Fairclough (2003) and van Dijk (2001), are both socially reinforced and reproduced through discourse. In terms of the State's ideological foundations of orientations to bilingualism and language acquisition planning, the first sentence of CL-628B expresses a clear ideology, one that is reiterated throughout the leaflet: "Bilingual Authorizations allow holders to provide instruction to English Learners." Returning to Woolard's (1998) position that the practices that encompass an ideology have social and linguistic implications, granting permission to "holders" to teach only those students labeled as English Learners narrows "bilingualism" to be reserved only for students who have been labeled as "deficient" in English. This language, in addition to the delineation of types of instruction authorized, signals two language planning orientations – a language (other than English)-as-problem orientation, one that bilingual education can remedy, and language-as-resource (with which to learn other languages) orientation. In other words, in CL-628B (and AB 1871), English is the goal, and therefore the most important language in the realm of the California pK-12 education system.

At the same time, the use of home languages is the State-sanctioned "best practice" to achieve this goal. Three times total in both the first and third sentences of the

first paragraph of CL-628B, instruction to English Learners is referenced. Though not explicitly defined in CL-628B, English Learner is the most common terminology for students who have been labeled as "lacking"[14] sufficient English while speaking a different language (or languages) at home. California has no official label for students who are growing up learning two or more languages simultaneously – nor a label for students who speak English at home but are learning in a different language at school. Further, each use of English Learner/EL in the California Department of Education's *Glossary of Terms used in California Basic Educational Data System and the Language Census Data Reports* includes the qualification "formerly known as Limited-English-Proficient or LEP" even though, according to the same glossary, many years have now passed since 1998, when the CDE replaced "Limited English Proficient" with "English Learner." A search of the CDE website displays numerous references to LEP still currently in use. I return to Fairclough's (2003) consideration of ideologies as "representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination, and exploitation" (p. 9). Thereby, the ideology of the State displayed in CL-628B continues to maintain the domination of English as the important language worth learning. It also continues to

[14] **English Learner (EL) Students (Formerly Known as Limited-English-Proficient or LEP)**
English learner students are those students for whom there is a report of a primary language other than English on the state-approved Home Language Survey **and** who, on the basis of the state approved oral language (grades Kindergarten through grade twelve) assessment procedures and literacy (grades three through twelve only), have been determined to lack the clearly defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs. (R30-LC)
https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/glossary.asp#el

position languages other than English (LOTE, as the CCTC labels its exam) as educationally appropriate primarily as resources of instruction to strengthen "limited" English proficiency.

Bilingualism and biliteracy are not indexed as goals to accompany academic English proficiency. I label this in-between orientation as a language-as-problematic-resource. Examined more thoroughly in Chapter 6, this unconvincing positioning of languages of instruction other than English as "valuable" does not acknowledge any resources for cognitive, sociocultural, academic, or critical consciousness benefits of multilingualism.

Coded correspondences. To better understand the context of the production of CL-628B, I next turn to coded correspondences. These are notices published by the CCTC's director, referencing proposed or approved amendments to or clarifications of the California educational code. Coded correspondences are not written for credential applicants per se, even though they are all addressed to, "All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing." According to the CCTC, coded correspondence is "Official CCTC correspondence that typically notifies the public and interested parties of pending changes or implementation of changes in regulations, policies and procedures." A member of the public can subscribe to electronic CCTC news and receive these notices; without actively seeking a subscription or searching the CCTC website for these notices. It is unclear how others might receive this information. However, the context provided in the communications – both as representative of the State's circulating discourses and as background context for current language in CL-628B – offers a broader historical picture of bilingual education

according to the State. Specifically, an examination of the kinds of instruction permitted via the bilingual authorization (and previously BCLAD) prior to Proposition 227 and since, suggests that, up to the current version of the bilingual authorization, the position of the State-as-legislative-body has been invariable. Bilingual education is the domain of English Learners. This position stands in contrast to ideologies being operationalized at the district level in Oakland, as well as beliefs held by Olmeda's most recently prepared bilingual teachers. It may also stand in contrast with individual members of the CCTC. Table 4 displays relevant language segments across the 1998, 2004, and 2010 coded correspondences. Bolded and underlined words are discussed below the table.

Table 4

Coded Correspondences Referencing the Bilingual Authorization

98-9805: 1998	04-0001: 2004	10-22: 2010
The BCLAD Certificate	SB 2042 Multiple Subject with BCLAD Emphasis	The bilingual authorization
authorizes the holder to provide both of the services authorized by the CLAD certificate as specified in Section 80015.2(b) [(1) Instruction for English language development…	This document authorizes the holder to provide the following services to **English learners**: (1) instruction for English language development …	authorizes the holder to provide both of the services authorized by the CLAD certificate and English learner authorization as specified in Section 80015.2(b) [(1) Instruction for English language development…
(2) Specially designed <u>academic</u> instruction delivered in English…] and both of the following services to **limited-English-proficient students**...	(2) specially designed <u>content</u> instruction delivered in English …	(2) Specially designed <u>academic</u> instruction delivered in English…] and both of the following services to **English learners**
(1) Content instruction delivered in the students'	(3) content instruction delivered in the **<u>language of emphasis</u>** listed above	(1) Content instruction delivered in the students' **<u>primary language</u>** in the

Table 4

Coded Correspondences Referencing the Bilingual Authorization

98-9805: 1998	04-0001: 2004	10-22: 2010
primary language in the subjects and at the levels authorized by the prerequisite credential or permit …	in multiple-subject-matter (self- contained) classes...	subjects and at the grade or age levels authorized by the prerequisite credential or permit…
(2) Instruction for primary language development…	(4) instruction for primary language development in the **language of emphasis**...	(2) Instruction for primary language development…

Tracks of legislative voices and traces of individual voices. Beginning with Coded Correspondences 98-9805 and 04-0001, dated January 12, 2004, it is possible to follow some of the legislative processes of discourse production and State stances on bilingual education. The 1998 correspondence is included because it contains language of the education code (CCR) dated to April 1998, just before Proposition 227 and SB 2042. It also outlines two changes in wording that both date to 1998.

First, it refers to students receiving instruction by teachers with a bilingual authorization as "limited-English-proficient." This terminology was to be replaced with "English Learner" during the following school year; both subsequent documents refer to English Learners. The second change was the modification of "specially designed content instruction delivered in English" to "specially designed academic instruction delivered in English," which today is called by its acronym, SDAIE. While "content instruction" in English switched to "academic instruction," "content instruction delivered in the students' primary language," also part of CCR, did not, and to this day this language remains the same.

In terms of interpreting those differences from the context of a language education scholar, nothing unusual stands out from the usage of "content" – "content" is solidly established in language education (e.g., CBI – Content Based Instruction and CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning). However, when placing "academic" and "content" side-by-side, with one word assigned to English and the other to "Other," questions arise as to how the text producers understood these two words. From the context of someone less familiar with terminology in language education, it is not unreasonable to assign "specially designed academic instruction" a status as separate and different from, and perhaps *more* academic than, content instruction not recognized as specially designed, even though it is in a different language. The placement of two languages side by side in this text draws the reader to compare the two. As such, the elevation of academic instruction in English to special design also relegates content instruction in other languages as not meriting "special" design.

The subject heading of the 2004 coded correspondence is "Clarification of Authorizations to Teach English Learners," and addresses SB 2042 and AB 1059, a bill which required the CCTC to ensure, by July 1, 2002, that accredited EPPs satisfied Commission standards for teacher preparation "for all pupils, including English language learners." As noted in Chapter 3, the bilingual authorization was left out of SB 2042 in 1998, and seven years passed before attention returned to the specifics of the authorization. The 2004 correspondence contains a table that lists all names of documents issued between 1994 and 2004 by the Commission that pertained to "service to English Learners." Similar to language in the 1998 correspondence and CL-628B, but missing specific acknowledgement of both content *and* language instruction in "primary"

language, three types of instruction are delineated: ELD, SDAIE, and "Instruction in Primary Language (Bilingual)" (CCTC, 2004, p. 2). 04-0001 also includes the revised language of the SB 2042 authorization codes; this is included for comparison in Table 4.

Interestingly, the language of "New Ryan Authorization Codes effective 11/24/03" did *not* include the CCR change from "content instruction in English" to "academic instruction in English." Again, only instruction in English is described as "specially designed." However, a different change occurred in the 2004 wording: "Content instruction delivered in primary language" changed to "content instruction delivered in the language of emphasis." This change is subtle, and text that follows returns to use of "primary language" to index non-English. However brief, this subtle change suggests that the author(s) of an authorization description did not copy and paste from California law. "Language of emphasis" is terminology used only in bilingual authorization language proficiency testing. When applied in this context, it appears to reference a broader vision of bilingual education, one that did not automatically assign "primary language" status to the non-English portion of bilingual education.

The 2010 coded correspondence contains another usage of an alternate expression to index bilingualism. In a separate location of this 25-page document, outside the specific credential descriptors, permission via the bilingual authorization to teach in "primary language" shifts to permission to teach in "a language other than English" (CCTC 2010, p. 2). Here, the holder is teaching in a language other than English – not by default teaching English Learners. This subtle shift in language stands out. The author of 10-22, the executive director of the CCTC, produced text that represents an expanding view of bilingual classroom instruction. However, this coded correspondence addresses

newly updated statements to ensure uniformity when describing the bilingual authorization, and the inclusion of CCR Title V, § 80015.2 (included in Table 4) shows that the education code remains word-for-word unchanged as far back as 1998 in areas describing services provided "to English learners." On the whole, the State, as represented by language attributed to approval by a body of legislators, in contrast to individual authors of coded correspondences, maintains its position that, even through the last two decades of amendments and changing legislation, when credentialing teachers, compensatory bilingual education, in service to English Learners, remains the only program the State considers when authorizing teachers to be in bilingual classrooms.

Bilingual authorization program standards. A final document of the State is examined to further excavate ideologies of bilingual education in California. The *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards* handbook is written for EPPs seeking to acquire or renew accreditation to offer a bilingual authorization. It references standards adopted in 2008 and was revised in 2015. Though it is unclear who the most recent authors of the revision are – and what was revised – the bilingual certification design team listed inside dates from 2006-2007, and its 16 members were California teachers, administrators, and professors in schools of education. The handbook, while continuing to maintain the State's position on the hierarchical importance of English via statements such as the following, in the handbook's introduction: "The bilingual teaching authorization prepares individuals to provide English language development, specially designed academic instruction in English and academic content instruction in both English and the language of their bilingual authorization" (p. 2), also makes the most

substantial space for other orientations to language planning and ideologies underlying these orientations.

To receive accreditation, EPPs are required to answer multiple program planning questions aligned to each of the bilingual authorization program standards. Examination of the program planning questions specific to these standards suggests that actors assembling at the state level to create this handbook both maintain the State's ideology while also providing opportunities to challenge it. One clear example is the first program planning question, 4.1 of Standard 4, Bilingual Methodology, which asks, "How does the program design and develop the candidates' understanding of the applications, benefits and limitations of different bilingual program models?" (p. 12). This is the first mention of multiple program models that serve multiple applications. By specifying program planning geared specifically toward biliteracy, Question 4.12, "How does the program ensure that candidates have the ability to reflect upon and implement effective practice that fosters the development of biliteracy through content instruction?" (p. 13) indexes the importance of biliteracy in a bilingual classroom. Finally, Question 4.14 asks "How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate the ability to review and evaluate materials, to identify potential areas of offense or bias (e.g., race, class, gender, religion, country of origin) and to ensure appropriate representation of linguistic and cultural diversity within and across language and cultural groups?" (p. 14) Though language is not listed as a potential area of bias, this question stands out in light of the linguistic – and by extension – race, class, and country of origin bias toward English exhibited by the State in the other policy documents examined. Further, (specific to Standard 3, The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism) programs are expected to articulate

differences between a deficit perspective of bilingual education (e.g., "viewing the primary language as an obstacle, limiting use of the primary language, promoting assimilation in the target culture") (p. 11) and an "enrichment perspective." Via the space allowed between programming and accreditation, EPPs are able to contextualize bilingual education in ways that are more expansive that the State's narrow interpretation.

While space appears that allows EPPs to broaden the context of bilingual education, the handbook also serves as an example of discourse production held to a different dimension of time than that of discourse interpretation. The authors write that "bilingual program standards have been designed to address current research and methodologies in bilingual education" (p. 4). However, in addition to the seven years that elapsed after the passage of SB 2042 and the assembly of a committee to consider bilingual authorizations subsequent to this bill, examination of the handbook reinforces concerns about how often the State actually considers the field of bilingual education and underlines how legislative movement does not keep pace with local appropriation of policies. For example, in Section 2, under a description of "Pedagogies for Bilingualism and Biliteracy" is the following: "Emerging research on biliteracy instruction in the United States is derived from various disciplines including cognitive science (Durán, 1981), neuroscience and brain research (Pettito et al., 2005), applied and pure linguistics, and reading/biliteracy research (Jiménez, 1997)" (2015, p. 6). Whether or not these citations may stand as foundational is not a focus of this study; however, their assignation as "emerging" does place a timestamp on the State's evaluation of appropriate resources.

Further, Appendix B of the handbook is a list of "Resources for the Preparation of Bilingual Educators." Of the 91 titles listed, the latest publication date is 2009 – the same

date as the handbook (if not considering 2015 revisions). Only four titles are listed for this date; one on California law (Education Code), two California Department of Education publications on teaching English Learners, and one on educating English Learners in dual language classrooms. One additional resource was published in 2008 (on conceptions of teaching by Vietnamese-American preservice teachers), two in 2007 (one on educating Vietnamese-American students, one – in Spanish - on Spanish literacy instruction in bilingual classrooms), three in 2006 (Thomas Friedman's neoliberal best-seller, *The World is Flat*, Colin Baker's heavily cited *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, and Edward Olivos' *The Power of Parents*) and six in 2005. Seventy-six recommended titles were published in 2004 or earlier. Though the handbook, drafted in 2009, was updated in 2015, the resource list was not, suggesting that material specific to bilingual curriculum and instruction was not. In the field of bilingual education, much has evolved since 2009 in terms of voters' rejection of Proposition 227, the State Board of Education's adoption of Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards, and scholars' work on theory and pedagogy in bilingual education.

To be clear, CL-628B does not reference transitional bilingual education at any point in the text; it does, however, prioritize English and minimize academic growth in other languages. The three correspondence memos, when analyzed alongside the accreditation handbook, show a slight progression identifying bilingual education less as compensatory (to balance a deficit of English) and more toward bilingualism and biliteracy. An acknowledgement of the depth and breadth of linguistic diversity among Californians is most evident in text production at the Bilingual Certification Design Team dimension.

Though beyond the scope of this study to examine the cumulative knowledge and ideologies of panel members as well as legislators amending California's code of education, it is clear that the State, as represented through its legislative body, continues to reproduce a discourse connected to language-as-problematic-resource. The EPP accreditation handbook suggests compliance yet also slow movement toward demonstration of validation of bilingualism beyond serving primarily as a resource for English. However, this shift does not match the faster pace of Oakland Unified. Though the U.S. has legislated bilingual compensatory education (e.g., transitional bilingual education) since *Lau v. Nichols* (1974), as I will show in the last half of Chapter 4, several study participants working in the current field of bilingual education were surprised at how clearly the state of California recognizes "English Learners" *only* as those who are present in bilingual classrooms. In CL-628B, the absence of reference to any student who is not an English Learner sanctions bilingual education only to strengthen the English of those who are "lacking" because they speak other languages. While districts and teachers around the state may be challenging this orientation, any challenge falls outside the stated parameters of the bilingual authorization, thereby positioning the challenges as just that – unsanctioned and unrecognized.

This first section has answered how language ideologies are produced at the state level, and while there is movement away from language-as-problematic-resource in EPP accreditation, the most power-wielding bilingual policy for new teachers is not their alma maters' accreditation manuals – it is CL-628B. CL-628B clearly produces a language-as-problematic-resource orientation. Next I turn to how Oakland Unified and individuals

within interpret and reproduce the various language ideologies circulating among various dimensions.

Ideologies of the Bilingual Authorization: One School, One District, Multiple Voices

This study views policy texts as social events that are produced and interpreted among people within the same broad context. If the position of the State is that bilingual education is oriented to a language-as-problematic-resource, for *only* English non-proficient children, assessed by the State *only* in English on their language proficiency (or deficiency) until they score high enough to reclassify as "Reclassified Fluent English Proficient," how does an ideal reader – i.e., someone committed to bilingualism and biliteracy in California – interact with a policy text drafted by the State? The first section of Chapter 4 examined how language ideologies that circulate at a macro level are produced by the State; this next section concentrates on how the language ideologies that circulate via CL-628B were interpreted by individuals at the school and district level. Responses are organized into three groups – early-career teachers, their school-based support providers, and their district-level proponents. Returning to Fairclough's (2001) three dimensions of discourse – context, interaction, and text – for most respondents, local context, i.e., the social conditions of interpretation, did not appear to align with the State context, i.e., the social conditions of production. As such, the examination of processes of interpretation in Oakland reveals more nuanced ideologies of language, bilingualism, and bilingual education.

During the first (or only) research interview, each participant was asked to read the first page of CL-628B, and asked three questions:

1. What are your initial thoughts after looking through this first page?

2. How do you define bilingual education, and how do you see your definition placed within the bilingual authorization text?
3. How do you see your definition of bilingual education reflected in the programming and norms of Olmeda?

Findings indicate a range of interpretations of the text, and these interpretations connect to the contextual understandings of bilingual education that each interviewee had. Those whose careers rest in bilingual education indexed discomfort or resistance to the text; those not as familiar with the field responded differently.

Early-career teachers at Olmeda: Discomfort via resistance, annexation, self-minimization. This section examines how the three most novice education professionals – Sage, Sam, and Melisa – responded to CL-628B, positioning themselves in distinct ways vis-à-vis their reading of the document. Their three positions; resistance, annexation, and self-minimization, stand in contrast to each other, and offer a glimpse into the complexities of text interaction, even when, at one dimension, the locational context may appear to be the same. While Sage, Sam, and Melisa all attempted to make sense of CL-628B given their own work at Olmeda *already* as appropriators of this policy, when asked to refer to the "rules" themselves, their responses displayed varying degrees of discomfort with and confrontation of the text.

Sage: Discomfort asserted via resistance. Upon being asked her initial thoughts to the first page of CL-628B, Sage situated her response within her experience of an education system that indeed preferences English. She positioned herself as a resistor to this type of education. (4.1, see Appendix C for transcription conventions.)

Excerpt 4.1 May 2, 2017, Sage on CL-628B: English Emphasis

1	S	Well it's (.) it's interesting because (...) Like and I've always found this (.)
2		but it's the emphasis is much more on learning English than on creating
3		like fully bilingual biliterate students. Right?
4	K	=Mhmm->
5	S	=Like even instruction in primary language (.) it's framed within like (.)
6		let's use instruction in their primary language to support acquisition of
7		content and language in English.

Sage consistently referred to her students as bilingual – not as English Learners. Her phrase "fully bilingual biliterate students" actively disrupts the State's use of "English Learners." In so doing, Sage distanced herself from the language of CL-628B and the State. When repeating language from the text in Line 5, "instruction in primary language," Sage made an exemplar – *even* this phrase, she said, is framed within "acquisition and content of language in English." In Excerpt 4.2 below, she continued to avoid the phrase "English Learner" and refer to a broader goal – that of "fully bilingual people" (not just "fully bilingual students"). She repeated the importance of strong academic language in both Spanish and English:

Excerpt 4.2 May 2, 2017, Sage on bilingual education: "Fully bilingual biliterate people"

1	S	So I mean and a part of SF State's program and part of why I like (.) the
2		lens that that they take in a way is that they ((sneezing, blessings)) is that
3		their goal is like (.) and they reinforced with like our goal is fully
4		bilingual biliterate people. That our students will be able to write and
5		read just as well in both languages at a high academic level in both
6		languages. And so I think for me when I go into teaching (.) that's
7		definitely more of what I hold.

In Excerpt 4.2, Sage connected her definition of bilingual education to that of her alma mater, using language such as "lens" (Line 2) that indexes a political point of view. In contrast to language of the State, she mentioned performance goals in both languages "at a high academic level" (Line 5), thereby co-locating "academic" not with "instruction

in English" but with "both languages." In this way, Sage both reproduced the ideology of her alma mater and challenged the language of the State.

When asked the third question, Sage spoke at length about how her vision of bilingual education was reflected at Olmeda. She was in her second year of teaching in Olmeda and in the district and had spent considerable time participating in district and school-based ELD trainings. During the year prior to the study, she and I, along with several other Olmeda teachers, attended a three-part evening training to use a specific ELD curriculum; Sage had also completed a week-long intensive GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Device - heavily scaffolded content and English instruction) training prior to the beginning of her second year. Throughout the school year during which this study took place, all district bilingual elementary schools were participating in focused education on strengthening content-based English instruction. These sessions were administered by a highly regarded nonprofit educational research and service agency. The 6-week cycle of Olmeda PD that had finished just prior to this interview was on GLAD strategies applied in English and Spanish. In Excerpt 4.3, Sage pointed to the District as *the* location of challenge to her and Olmeda's mutual goal of "fully bilingual people" and assigned a hierarchy of bureaucratic decision-making to the Spanish language-specific resources Olmeda was using.

Excerpt 4.3 May 2, 2017, Sage on full biliteracy/bilingualism: "I don't see that in our district"

1	K	So if you're saying your vision of bilingual education is more toward full
2		biliteracy and bilingualism (.) how do you see Olmeda's (.) programming
3		and the way things are going here? in relation to your vision of bilingual
4		education?
5	S	So. (h) I think generally there is a sentiment across the school that our
6		schools do that and unfortunately (.) I don't think our district holds the
7		same sentiment.

8 K OK
9 S I don't see that in our district. I don't see that in like, I see that, if that
10 was a sentiment that was held in our district, there would be Spanish
11 language development resources. Not just ELD. You know? We have **so**
12 many trainings now on what designated and integrated ELD looks like.
13 You know like we spend all this time with [ELD training organization]. I
14 think Olmeda does that a little bit too. You know? I don't think Olmeda
15 necessarily has all the resources for Spanish teachers that (.) to push for
16 that. You know it's like even Lucy Calkins which doesn't work, in
17 Spanish. It's like our district doesn't have a curriculum and it's not all
18 Olmeda's fault cause Olmeda has to (.) use District curriculum. Olmeda
19 has access to District resources. It's not like we can make these Spanish
20 resources just like appear? So I know it's a lot harder. There's a lot less of
21 especially good ones. It's like, **so I get that**. I see the ethic and the
22 sentiment is that our students are writing and reading at a high level in
23 both languages. But I don't see it in our professional development. I don't
24 see it happen (.) at our district level either like there's very little offered
25 in terms of actually (…) And what we see is just like, *Words Their Way*
26 into Spanish which is really it doesn't, it's like not helpful. From what
27 I've heard from all the Spanish teachers. *Words Their Way* in Spanish
28 isn't. Cause Spanish doesn't work like that. And Lucy isn't helpful
29 because some of the strategies that Lucy is doing you just don't.

In Lines 17-20, Sage positioned Olmeda as an institution required to follow District decrees. Sage's writing instruction alternated between units in Spanish and English, and she allied herself with the teachers teaching language arts in Spanish. Not all were happy with two recent curricular changes – adoption of Lucy Calkins' Readers'/Writers' Workshop (with the expectation that teachers translate the lessons into Spanish), and purchase of *Words Their Way* word study curriculum in both Spanish and English. Her comments in Line 17 and 28, that "our district doesn't have a curriculum" and "Spanish doesn't work like that" illustrate how she considered side-by-side English and Spanish curricular materials like *Words Their Way* as inappropriate curriculum. Her comments in Lines 16-17 that "Lucy Calkins... doesn't work in Spanish" and Line 29 that "some of the strategies that Lucy is doing you just don't" indicate her frustration with an assumption

she assigned to the District that requiring teachers to translate English curriculum into Spanish is an acceptable practice. When asked both about her own vision of bilingual education and her interpretation of CL-628B, Sage displayed resistance to external power wielders in both arenas: the state level and district level. She backed her resistance with astute observations and was not hesitant to do so.

Sam: Discomfort eased via annexation. While Sage positioned herself as a vocal resistor both to what she saw as the State's and the District's focus on English in bilingual education, Sam indexed his discomfort less emphatically. After reading CL-628B, Sam initially responded with similar equivocation as Sage. They both begin with "Well" (Excerpts 4.1 and 4.4, Line 1), yet while Sage disagreed via "it's interesting," and that she'd "always found" that the emphasis was on learning English rather than fully bilingual students (4.1, Line 1), Sam said that he was "wondering" (4.4, Line 1) about instruction for "just" primary language development (4.4, Lines 1-2).

Excerpt 4.4 May 17, 2017, Sam on CL-628B: "Ideally you want a 50/50"

1	Sam	Well the one thing I'm wondering (.) cause it just says instruction for
2		primary language development. It just says for EL students which (...) I
3		mean **here** that's almost all (.) we have but ideally you want like a 50/50,
4	K	(Yeah)
5	Sam	So @@@

In Excerpt 4.4, Sam immediately zeroed in on "English Learners" being written in as the only students envisioned in bilingual education. However, rather than interpreting this statement as an indication of English learning as the ideal – not full bilingualism and biliteracy – Sam represented the "ideal" (4.4, Line 3) as evenly balanced English and "other" language-proficient student groups. This dual-language model tends to align clearly (though not without critique) with a language-as-resource orientation. Like Sage,

Sam did appear to disagree with the wording of CL-628B. However, at the same time, he also indicated, via Lines 2-3, "I mean **here** that's almost all we have," that he was working in a less-than-(his) ideal setting at Olmeda, as Olmeda's students matched the State's delineation.

Sam returned to his own ideal, in Excerpt 4.5, when asked how he defined bilingual education. As did Sage, he expressed biliteracy as the goal. Different from Sage, biliteracy is the only goal he mentioned.

Excerpt 4.5 May 17, 2017, Sam on bilingual education: Biliteracy is the goal

1	K	All right so then my next question for you is how do you define bilingual
2		education.
3	Sam	(...) I would define it as (...) Teaching in a way that (.) students (.) will be
4		biliterate. Teaching in both their primary language and a language that
5		they have not yet learned in order to be biliterate by the end of the
6		program.
7	K	Okay okay. And how do you see your definition placed within **this**
8		bilingual authorization language?
9	Sam	It is odd that it only includes EL students because you know at a lot of
10		bilingual schools like they have half (.) English only speaking
11		students that are trying to learn Spanish or whatever language (...) And I
12		don't know the wording (…) well yeah I guess here where it says to
13		develop their listening speaking reading and writing skills in their
14		primary language (...) I think that fits into how I think of bilingual
15		education because (.) we're trying to get them not just (.) like the primary
16		language of instruction isn't just to **help** them until they can learn
17		English it's to get them proficient in their primary language as well.
18	K	Okay, okay, a::nd then how do you see your vision or those goals
19		reflected in the programming or expectations of Olmeda?
20	Sam	I mean (.) I think (.) I think that's the goal. Like I think everyone wants
21		(.) our students to be biliterate. I think it would be better if we had like
22		native English speaker (.) students, so it's like an actual 50-50. And I
23		think it is hard, to put as much emphasis on Spanish? because like the
24		focus I guess like District State like whatever is English. Like the focus
25		is on ELD. Getting reading levels up in English? I mean resources are
26		hard to come by in Spanish so I think ideally (.) you'd want there to be an
27		equal emphasis on both I think. That's something that's hard to do. (And
28		I don't think we necessarily have that.)

Sam worked to make sense of the "oddness" (4.5, Line 9) of CL-628B mentioning only English Learners. Sam's vision of bilingual education is likely heavily influenced by his own school-based Spanish acquisition as well as his first-year teaching in a dual language school where the student population more closely matched to a 50-50 English-Spanish home language ratio. Ultimately, in a move I call annexation, even though CL-628B does not reference English-dominant students as being taught in *their* primary language, Sam decided the State's language did "fit" (4.5 line 14) his own definition after all (Lines 12-17). In doing this, Sam annexed the State's stance to his own personal belief in the educational goal of biliteracy. This comfort with maneuvering what appears as an authoritative text to match his own more expansive perspective of bilingualism stands out in contrast to both Sage and Melisa's responses to CL-628B. Explored more deeply in Chapter 5 via ethnographic data, Sam projected at times an unconscious sense of ease with authority (i.e., CL-628B). This comfort may have allowed him to reconfigure, rather than confront, something that he did in fact disagree with.

Finally, Excerpt 4.5 concludes (Lines 20-28) with Sam's response to the third question, which asked teachers how they saw their definitions of bilingual education reflected in programming at Olmeda. His and Sage's responses were similar – he also said that Spanish resources (whether specific to Spanish language development or content in Spanish is unclear) were "hard to come by" (Line 26) at Olmeda. Further, like Sage, he also positioned Olmeda as holding biliteracy as a goal, in contrast with both the District's and the State's emphasis on ELD (Line 24). Ultimately, Sam stated that Olmeda too fell short of realizing his interpretation of "equal emphasis on both" languages (Lines 27). While Sam and Sage appear in agreement that both CL-628B and OUSD overemphasize

English and not biliteracy, Lines 21-22 of Excerpt 4.5 reveal a different perspective as well. Sam stated, "I think it would be better if we had like native English speaker students, so it's like an actual 50-50." While Olmeda's 50-50 division of instruction is the program model the school had chosen to develop bilingualism and biliteracy in both languages, Sam was looking for a 50-50 division of students by "native speakers." The statement that adding a 50% English-speaking population would "be better" and influence the District (and State) to value Spanish acquisition more if English-speaking students are learning it, suggests an underlying connection between viewing the education system as designed to strengthen education for English-dominant students; not necessarily for Spanish-dominant students. Connected to Sam's educational history, both as a White student opting to learn Spanish and as a White teacher with limited contextual experiences of bilingual education spaces, Sam's interpretation of what bilingual education "should be" reproduces themes that appear throughout the current field (c.f. Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017; Delavan et al., 2016; Flores, 2016; Flores, 2017; García & Flores, 2017; Valdés, 1997).

Melisa: Discomfort expressed via self-minimization. Asked how she defined bilingual education, Melisa's response was short: "My definition was basically that you're authorized to teach in Spanish. You know just how… a regular credential, right?" From the beginning of this portion of our interview, Melisa's responses (Excerpts 4.6 and 4.7), consistently yielded to the authoritative tone of CL-628B and the State's authority to grant permission to teach in Spanish. This became problematic as the conversation went on, as the more we talked, the more Melisa did not just defer to the State's authority, she

began to doubt how she was teaching, minimizing her first language in the process. When asked her initial impression of CL-628B, Melisa began as follows (4.6):

Excerpt 4.6, May 4, 2017, Melisa on CL-628B: Spanish becomes a foreign language

1	M	This is kind of interesting because it just says it “allows the holder to
2		provide instruction to English Learners.” Doesn't necessarily sa::y in
3		Spanish or English. Which that's interesting. Like that was my first
4		thing. And then you know you go ok.
5	K	=Yeah yeah (.) keep going.
6	M	Cause then you go down he::re and like this is the same thing. Right?
7		Just like for them “to develop (.) listening speaking reading in English”.
8		(.) So that's interesting. But then over he::re, for the instruction for
9		primary language development (.) it's in the primary language (.) this one
10		again is in English (.) like they're all basically in English except for that.
11		Which that, I wouldn't have ever thought that to be honest. You know,
12		I'm more if you have a bilingual authorization, you are (.) **author**ized to
13		teach in that language that you got the authorization in. Which would be
14		Spanish. You know, and it's kind of like what I'm doing right now, it's
15		like I'm teaching all in Spanish but for me, like looking at this, that's not
16		the case. (…) It's I'm teaching. ELs. In English.
17	K	So do you think that there is, how does that (h…) whe:re, where do you
18		see your definition then sort of placed, or what you're doing right now,
19		placed within the broader goals?
20	M	[That? Yeah, well I mean I definitely do, I mean I teach ELs, right? I
21		mean all of Olmeda is, they're English Learners, right? Most of Olmeda
22		is. So going with this (.) it's like I **am** teaching ELs, but then I don’t like,
23		for this, I don’t necessarily need to be teaching them in **Span**ish. Right?
24		Am I tripping!? Or, no.
25	K	Well I (.) [I don’t know] I can’t, (.) I shouldn’t offer my opinion while
26		I’m interviewing you? [Oh OK] But I (.) so can **you** expand a little bit
27		more on like (.) cause you keep saying well that’s interesting. That’s
28		interesting. I mean it’s interesting to me too.
29	M	Because then, you don’t need a ((hand on table)) bilingual authorization.
30	K	Or it’s saying you, to teach English Learner::s English, you can do that
31		in Spanish. Building...
32	M	O::hhhhh
33	K	If there, because if there is primary language development instructing for
34		English Learners
35	M	=right
36	K	to develop their listening in their **prim**ary language (.) and then content
37		is delivered in
38	M	=Yeah.
39	K	primary language.
40	M	But then these two which yeah yeah. These two are in primary language.

41		So yes I can see how I can be (.) helping them you know develop these
42		skills **through Spanish. For English**. Right? Like I can see that. But
43		then this first line, it says like it allows the holder to provide instruction
44		to **English Learners**. It doesn't necessarily say like (.) the **language** it's
45		being provided **in**. And to me (.) a bilingual authorization is that you're
46		authorized to (.) that you're supposedly this expert to be able to teach
47		them in that foreign language. Right?
48	K	Mhmm? Mhmm?
49	M	Um. (Yeah. I don't know.) That's just, I'm very confu::sed right now.
50		Because then I feel like (.) let's say the other 4th grade teacher who
51		teaches English (...) Like this is what she's **do**ing. Other than these two.
52		Right? And she's not teaching them in Spanish. (.) So then I feel like for
53		**me**, these are the only two things that I need to do. I don't know!

My own positionality as ethnographer, colleague, and advocate factors into my interviews with all three early-career teachers, but perhaps most in my interviews with Melisa. In Excerpt 4.6, Melisa made meaning by talking through her thought process as she read portions of CL-628B out loud. I encouraged her (Line 5) and as she became more emotional, evidenced by rising pitch and slapping her hand on the table, I interpreted this emotion as anxiousness and tried to ease her confusion (Lines 30-39). This co-construction of our positions as novice (teacher) and specialist (researcher) – even though *I* felt like a novice, unsure of how to conduct a "proper" interview when my subject became emotional – can be seen as an interactional event (Talmy, 2011) that occurs throughout qualitative interviews. Regardless, this positioning doubtless shaped the direction of our conversation. Melisa repeated the verbal hedge "that's interesting," in Lines 1, 3 and 8, signaling her confusion and hesitant disagreement with the wording. Melisa also appeared hesitant to question the policy itself– or her role executing the policy. Melisa's use of "to be honest" in Line 11 served as an introduction to what she indicated may be an error on her part. This in turn framed her response both to me, the

interviewer, and the document itself, as confessional. Over the course of the 47 lines in Excerpt 4.6, Melisa refined her representation of the bilingual authorization three times, moving from a "regular credential" in Spanish to "I'm more if you have a bilingual authorization, you are authorized to teach in that language that you got the authorization in" (Lines 12-13) to "a bilingual authorization is that you're authorized to - that you're supposedly this expert to be able to teach them in that foreign language" (Lines 45-47). During this portion of the interview, Melisa began to question whether she was teaching to match the State's criteria, minimizing her own first language and professional self in the process. Further, Melisa stated, in Line 15, that though she was teaching "all in Spanish," according to her initial reading of the document, "that's not the case" outlined by the bilingual authorization. According to *her* understanding of the document, she was (not should be, but *was*) "teaching ELs in English." Further, 5 lines later (Lines 22-24), she stated "So going with this, it's like I **am** teaching ELs, but then I don't like, for this, I don't necessarily need to be teaching them in Spanish. Right? Am I tripping!?" When Melisa asked, "Am I tripping?" the pitch of her was quite high, as her voice had escalated along with her expressed confusion. With some pointing (Lines 30-39), Melisa saw that the document does also include teaching in the "primary language" but by this time, she had already accepted that she then was teaching "through Spanish for English" (Line 42, a clear connection to compensatory bilingual education) and "primary language" – her own first language – was replaced by a "foreign language" (line 47). Melisa was rapidly convinced by perhaps the authority vested in the document, perhaps the overwhelming dominance of English in the articulation of bilingual education, and doubtless layers of education and experiences that have shaped her throughout her life, that her first

language, as a U.S.-born citizen – and the first language of 99% of her students – became foreign. The excerpt ends with Melisa reiterating her confusion and concern that the wording of the document required her to perform all four bulleted types of instruction – ELD, primary language development, SDAIE, and content instruction delivered in the primary language. Less than two minutes later, we took a break in the interview for her to return to teaching. We continued the interview later that day, at which point Melisa continued to express confusion (Excerpt 4.7) about CL-628B.

Excerpt 4.7, May 4, 2017, Melisa on CL-628B: "I'm really confused!"

M I just feel (.) like I'm still so confused trying to even understand this? But like from what I understand it's like the definite connection between the bilingual authorization and like (.) what we have at Olmeda is like our **students** are obviously Els

K =Mhmm, mhmm?

M You know? Like (…) I know it's not a hundred percent but what 99% are ELs in here? So that definitely like I see that connection to and (…) I guess with like with me in my teaching? I do. I mean thinking about what I do with my team teacher? It's like we do. We try to get them. We give them the strategies in both languages you know like for Reader's Workshop for example. Well (…) I teach one strategy. She'll teach the other. So I guess not the same strategy in both languages? But we try to make them so that what she does in there I piggyback off of

K [Mhmm?

M [to then make it connect to the new strategy so they can not only use it in Engli- err Spanish but they can continue in Spanish or English and vice you know? **I'm really confused!**

K =Mhmm?

M =So which is kind of like what (…) this is like trying to get them to speak read in their primary language which is for me is Spanish (.) which makes sense and that's what I try to get them to do (.) so that they can also adopt that or use that for their English. But then **now** it's just making me think well what about Guerrero? Well like for her that I'm kind of just thinking like (.) well you teach them **English**, but I guess she isn't a bi-I mean she **is**. She does have her bilingual authorization but she's not the bilingual teacher. I'm **very** confused at this!

K = That's okay!

M =I AM!

Throughout the resumption of our interview on May 4, Melisa continued to defer to the document in front of her, CL-628B. In Lines 2-3 of 4.7, she began by connecting Olmeda's students to the State's designation of students in bilingual classrooms – "English Learners." She repeated in Lines 2 and 7 that she could see this connection between the bilingual authorization and Olmeda's population of ELs. Focused more on the document itself than how she saw her own definition of bilingual education reflected in the programming and norms of Olmeda, Melisa tried to connect her teaching role at Olmeda to the document rather than to Olmeda programming. Throughout 4.7, she repeated her confusion four times (Lines 1, 18, 27, and 29). In the process, she assigned Xiomara Guerrero, her partner teacher (who at the time taught in English, though had taught in Spanish other years), as "not bi-…not the bilingual teacher." In doing so, Melisa connected teaching *in Spanish* as the "bilingual" part of the job this team performed and teaching *in English* as the default monolingual part of the job. The positioning of English as the default language is evident throughout the data collected in this study; a similar position is more overtly articulated by Wayne in Excerpt 4.8.

Using Fairclough's (2001) three dimensions of CDA – description, interpretation, and explanation, defined in Chapter 4, this analysis of early-career teachers' interpretations of CL-628B provides an opportunity to examine how three different early-career teachers express their own experiential, relational, or expressive understandings of and responses to a power-wielding policy document. For Fairclough, "experiential" discourse considers how knowledge and beliefs are represented, "relational" understandings provide cues as to how social relationships are interpreted, and "expressive" discourse evaluates "the bit of reality it relates to" (2001, p. 93). During the

interviews, each teacher interpreted – and thereby reproduced – discourses of discomfort, either by resistance, annexation, or self-minimization at the ground level of policy implementation.

In terms of an "explanation" of Sage's and Sam's interaction with CL-628B, which follows in more detail in Chapter 6, it appears that, likely, Sam and Sage have not struggled with discomfort or disagreement in ways that have made them hesitate to disagree. They respond to their discomfort with a policy in ways that show their willingness to manipulate or fight the policy to make it fit their own ideals. In doing so, they both share their stances as advocates for bilingualism and biliteracy. Melisa, on the other hand, the (emergency-credentialed) teacher in the most fragile hiring position at Olmeda, as well as the only one of the three to be a direct *student* recipient of California's prominence of ELD during the concomitant dismantling of bilingual education, responded the most emotionally and deferentially to this one policy document. Through her acknowledgement of the policy as the voice of authority, she tried to conform her job to her understanding of it.

Olmeda teachers' support network: A spectrum of understanding via uncertainty, clarification, rejection, alignment. During the 2016-2017 school year, three people provided support specifically to the three early-career teachers in this study: Xiomara, Sam and Sage's BTSA coach; Wayne, Olmeda's literacy coach for Sam and Sage; and Madeleine, the school principal and sole observer of Melisa. In terms of data collection, I only collected observations and reflections from BTSA coaching sessions – not literacy coaching or Melisa's observations. These events either fell outside the timeline of data collection or outside my ability to collect data (i.e., while I was

teaching). Madeleine, Wayne, Xiomara, and I made up four of the six positions on the school's Instructional Leadership Team, a group that performed multiple curriculum and instruction-based tasks, the most relevant here being the planning of weekly professional development for all faculty. During this study's data collection, Wayne conducted all weekly PD sessions. Weekly PDs and BTSA coaching sessions are examined in Chapter 5. Two OUSD administrators also provided oversight of direct supports of these teachers: Alice Holst, Manager of New Teacher Support (BTSA program) and Nicole Knight, Executive Director of the ELLMA office, the office providing curricular and instructional guidance for all OUSD bilingual programs. In this section, I analyze responses of Olmeda teachers' support providers to the same three questions I asked of Sage, Sam, and Melisa. What appears in the responses of these participants is use of the document to clarify, question, contest, and/or align with bilingual education-as-represented in CL-628B. Though all three members of the Olmeda school support team and the two members of OUSD administration, comprising decades of experience and commitment to public education, shared clear stances of advocacy for all students and teachers, their own ideologies of bilingual education highlight how individually nuanced perspectives may hold implications for individual coaching relationships or individually-planned professional development sessions.

Wayne Allen, Olmeda Instructional Coach: Uncertainty and connections to known contexts. When I interviewed Wayne, 18 months into his position at Olmeda, he had just finished taking coursework specific to English Learners (the CLAD authorization) to complete the transfer of his New York credential to a California clear credential. When shown CL-628B, a document he had not seen before, Wayne talked

through his initial interpretation of the policy. It became clear that he was making sense of it by making connections to his recent coursework.

Excerpt 4.8, May 2, 2017, Wayne on CL-628B: Minimization of the bilingual aspect of the bilingual authorization

W We:ll some of it is interesting to me (.) becau:se (.) I feel like "specially designed academic instruction delivered in English" that (.) Miss Benjamin calls “SDAIE”?
=mhmm?
Um (…) that was that was a specific aspect of the (.) CLAD work I did and so I feel like I have some knowledge of **that** and I (.) that was one of the things I had to do for my observations and the lesson **didn't feel** like I was over planning for ELs? It felt like I was planning a really thoughtful lesson and trying to give access to everybody you know. There was a **few** things that felt EL specific, but it would have been fine for the English Learners too. Like I mean for the native English speakers hhhh so it's interesting to me that (.) you almost get I feel like you get **authorized**. to teach that way where (.) **every**body should just be teaching that way. So that kind of (.) catches me how**ever** "content language and primary language" that (.) “content instruction in primary language" I can see I don't (...) you need authorization for that? or should you just be teaching like that. Like I don't understand that. Does that make sense?

K Yeah

W So (...) I I hhhh don't know. I just feel like this in TESOL we were looking at too. So I just feel like this (.) I don't know (.) I certainly couldn't get this, because I don't speak a different language. But other than **that** I feel like I could **get** this and so I or I should have it already! So (.) my feeling is (...) besides the actual aspect of bilingualism. And I think actually. Come to think of it though (.) what I also have learned is knowing - the more you know about the second language, the better able you are to help bridge the gap between the two
[mhmm?
[to support them in both learning in both so it, you do speak a primary lang-another language it probably helps with all this too? I don't know I just feel like it (...) maybe more teachers should be doing it I don't know if you need an authorization for it. That's my impression.

Throughout this excerpt, Wayne’s use of the verbal hedges “I feel” (Lines 1, 6, 12, 20, 21, 23, 31) and “I don’t know” (Lines 20, 21, 31), culminating in “I don’t know I just

feel" (Line 31) signaled his hesitancy to assert strongly that he fully understood the text. Wayne's first comment in response to CL-628B was his connection of his knowledge of the acronym SDAIE to Miss Benjamin's use of this term (Lines 2-3). This appears as an act of drawing on two voices of authority – the State and Olmeda's principal. As he continued to make sense of the policy text, Wayne connected it to a context he had most recently been studying (Line 5) – CLAD coursework – another source of authority. Drawing on the most prominent language in the text and applying it to his own limited experience of bilingual education (supporting teachers in English literacy at Olmeda), Wayne stated, "I feel like you get authorized to teach that way where everybody should just be teaching that way... 'content instruction in primary language' I can see I don't, you need authorization for that? Or should you just be teaching like that?" (Lines 13-17). This misapplication of his new learning, which continued throughout the excerpt, minimizes the actual "bilingual" aspect of the bilingual authorization in two ways. First, Wayne interpreted the primary goal of the bilingual authorization as building English proficiency by suggesting that "other than that" – speaking a different language – he could get the authorization (Lines 22-23). He did not articulate any aspects of culture (the C in CLAD) as relevant to "that." Second, Wayne further minimized the language and cultural aspects of teaching bilingually, misconstruing "content instruction in primary language" (Lines 15-16) as (only) instruction in English. "Primary" language, wherein primary might equal a language other than English, rested in a context outside Wayne's school experiences and his own primary language. He wondered out loud about the need for an authorization for what appeared to him to "just be" the way everyone should be teaching (Lines 15-16 and 31-33).

Without the SB 2042 credential requirements of CCTC, this seasoned teacher of English-only students likely would not have enrolled in university coursework to advance his practice in linguistically diverse classrooms. While thinking about programming and pedagogy that supports English Learners had been part of this coursework, as well as his coaching at Olmeda, Wayne had likely spent even less time thinking about the "bilingual" aspect of his school site. Asked how he would define bilingual education, Wayne paused and said, "That's a good question." Then he continued (Excerpt 4.9).

Excerpt 4.9, May 2, 2017, Wayne on bilingual education: "I'm probably not putting the right words"

1	W	I would (hhh) (...) define it (.) that students are (.) learning (.) in their
2		native language and in the dominant language of the (.) dominant
3		culture? So this would be in this case Spanish and English, **or** I guess
4		maybe **not** their native language cause there's some who are learning in
5		Spanish and English and that's (.) neither one of them is their native
6		language (...) So I guess (.) it's you're learning in two languages (…) I
7		think is how I would define bilingual (.) education. (hhh) (…) There was
8		something else I wanted to say but I got sidetracked (h...) you know (...)
9		with the goal of fluency in both (…) literacy in being literate fluent. I'm
10		probably not putting the right words but something like that.

Thinking about language learning was new to Wayne, and he was attempting to apply what he was learning in his California coursework to the questions I asked. For instance, in 4.8, Lines 5-6, "that was that was a specific aspect of the CLAD work I did and so I feel like I have some knowledge of that" and 4.8, Lines 20-21, "I just feel like this in TESOL we were looking at too." His answers, to a certain extent, align with a language-as-problematic-resource represented by the State. Wayne had not yet picked up on the District phrases referencing either dual language, bilingualism, or biliteracy. Asked to define bilingual education, Wayne first contrasted "native language" and "dominant language of the dominant culture" (4.9, Line 2), only moments after referring to "native

English" speakers (4.9, Line 6). Returning to Fairclough's description dimension of CDA, the "experiential" value of discourse considers how knowledge and beliefs are represented, and word choices serve as cues to the ideologies held by the text producer. It is difficult to discern, as Wayne seemed, via his stumbles (4.9, Lines 9 and 10), six pauses, and sighs (Lines 1, 7, 8) to be "trying on" new vocabulary, whether or not the combined use of "native" and "dominant" represents his experience of the social world where "native" usually references "not English" – unless it is co-located with English. "Dominant," then, would reference "English." Wayne's paradoxical position as an expert (teacher in English of English-proficient students) while also a novice (teacher-leader in bilingual education) is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

Wayne's newness to bilingual education may also have allowed him to note other aspects of CL-628B that other participants did not. For example, Wayne was the only Olmeda staff member who referenced Olmeda students who spoke a language other than Spanish or English at home. At the time of the study, Mam-speaking students with various levels of Spanish proficiency (from Mam-only to relative comfort in Spanish) were also enrolling in classrooms where he coached teachers. Once Wayne thought beyond the "native/dominant" dichotomy, he revised his definition (Excerpt 4.10) and began to wonder how to place his understanding of CL-628B in line with potential enrollment of students who did not fit an English-plus-authorized language model.

Excerpt 4.10, May 2, 2017, Wayne on the bilingual authorization: an uncomfortable wrinkle

1	K	OK OK. How do you see then your definition placed within thi:s **text**.
2		The bilingual authorization text.
3	W	(…….)So instruction specifically designed for English Learners, to
4		support them in English, so there's so I think that's (.) becoming (.)
5		moving towards one monoling- you know one of the bilinguals? in this

6		case. (hhh) Primary language development would be (.) Well. If your
7		primary language is Spanish (.) we have English and Spanish, in the
8		school, so I don't know how you instruct a child who is speaks Mandarin
9		but there isn't a Mandarin speaker in this (.) school right, or a teacher.
10		So. I'm a little confused by **tha**t I guess.
11	K	Mmm. You mean that if a Mandarin (.) only speaking child enrolled in
12		Olmeda->
13	W	=How do we, they just have
14	K	[with a bilingual authorization what are the teachers (.)
15		does this match their->
16	W	=Right. They just have. They're not gonna, this child is this child will not
17		be getting primary language development.
18	K	Correct.
19	W	Right, and so that which doesn't necessarily, it doesn't (.) **not** fit with my
20		definition but it's just dawning on me like well that's interesting. So it's
21		you're **they're** going to learn a second and a **third** language.
22	K	Right. Right.
23	W	Which is probably where you come in (...) (hhh) So I think that my
24		definition **does** fit within here the definitions of the instruction (.) and it
25		fits (.) there's (.) you know you are basically providing instruction in two
26		languages.
27	K	OK. OK.
28	W	=And support in both you know. I (.) I'm a little hung up on this **one**
29		primary language.
30	K	The second bullet number what the second points, yeah that's a really
31		good (.) observation. If you are a being instructed in your second and
32		third languages, does this bilingual, do the definitions (.) of types of
33		instruction (.) do any of those actually match trilingual
34	W	=Right ->
35	K	[or yeah multilingual students?
36	W	(…) English well yeah (...) English as a second language or third (…)
37		Yeah, it's interesting.
38	K	Mmhmm mhmm? I agree.
39	W	Yeah so I think my definition fits in there (.) but I have this little
40		wrinkle that I'm sitting with uncomfortably at this moment?
41	K	Well I hope it's not too uncomfortable. There are so many wrinkles in
42		policies. But that's a really good observation.
43	W	@@@ I'm fine. I'll get over it. Just curious.

In Lines 25, 26, and 28 of this excerpt, Wayne finally arrived at a definition of bilingual education in that "you are basically providing instruction in two languages... and support in both." It's possible he referenced Mandarin (which no students at Olmeda or the

neighboring school spoke) instead of Mam because I worked with newcomer students from the school next door as well. Though I worked with no Mandarin speakers, I did work with a Cantonese-speaking student. This slip may also reveal Wayne's experience of the social world – an experience that for the most part had been thousands of miles from Oakland, a city with a large and longstanding Cantonese-speaking community. Wayne's tendency to try out language that was sometimes slightly off (Line 5 – "monoling-one of the bilinguals"), sometimes more striking (native/dominant), to use Fairclough's "expressive value" that words have, suggests that Wayne's evaluation of the "bit of reality" (Fairclough, 2001 p. 93) he relates to includes comfort with and willingness to work through his understandings of authoritative texts, even in an unfamiliar area of his profession. At the same time, this willingness was accompanied by limited awareness of potential implications of social conditions of discourse production and interpretation.

Xiomara Guerrero, Olmeda Teacher Leader, BTSA Coach and Madeleine Benjamin, Olmeda Principal: Clarification that dual language equals bilingualism and biliteracy. Madeleine and Xiomara had worked closely together for six years prior to the study – as BTSA coach (Madeleine) and coachee (Xiomara), as grade-level teachers (Xiomara in third grade, Madeleine in fourth grade), as members on the ILT, and as close friends. During separate interviews, they expressed very similar visions of bilingual education. Both stated that its goals are bilingualism and biliteracy. Though CL-628B does not use the term "dual language" in reference to bilingual education, these two participants did. Both also referenced the District's movement away from transitional bilingual education when talking about Olmeda programming and the bilingual

authorization. In the following excerpt, contextual understanding of District priorities became further apparent as Madeline talked through her definition of bilingual education. She was careful to separate “bilingual education” (Excerpt 4.11, Line 2) which, to her, did not hold “ a truly bilingual person” as a goal (Line 5) like “dual language” education did (Line 3).

Excerpt 4.11, May 11, 2017, Madeleine on bilingual education: The goal is not to have bilingual students

1	Mad	Well (...) I definitely have (.) I don't know if I can define
2		bilingual education? I know what **my** theory of action is and **my** belief
3		system lies within **dual** language. Which is learning the primary
4		language or Spanish (.) with English. So when I (.) to me that's bilingual
5		education. The goal, the outcome, is to have a truly bilingual person.
6		What **really** bothers me is when we call early exit programs bilingual
7		programs, that's very con**fu**sing. It is **not** a bilingual program, those
8		programs are about (.) getting kids to learn (.) English I guess faster or
9		better, because you get a little bit of instruction first in your primary
10		language to then be able to transfer that. The goal is **not**. The goal is not
11		to have (.) bilingual students. The goal is so that they can transfer into
12		English more quickly because they have some of the skills in their
13		primary language so that's (.) what I think it's **not**. But that's what we **call**
14		it? I think that's very **frus**trating because (.) because when you want to
15		change an early exit **pro**gram like we've seen throughout the district
16		happen (.) because this **isn't** what's good for kids and there's data that
17		backs it u:p (.) we get a lot of **push**back because it's like (.) “oh you're
18		taking away a bilingual program”. (h) Not really.

Madeleine produced her definition of bilingual education using clear language of the District – phrases such as “theory of action” (Line 2) that are “data” (Line 16) driven and “outcome” (Line 5) based are articulated in multiple arenas of school planning in OUSD. Madeleine also referenced the school next door to Olmeda, which at the time of the study was phasing out its transitional bilingual program into English-only instruction – and was negotiating the change with frustrated families. Her comments related to very current events, and she appeared compelled to take a clear stance to position herself away from

the "early exit" proponents, emphasizing negation three times in 18 lines – "It's **not**/This **isn't** what's good for kids" (Lines 10, 13, 16).

When asked about her initial response to CL-628B, Madeleine's comments drew attention to both the text's heavy emphasis on (English) language learners (Line 2) and her own understanding of bilingual education as distinct from CLAD "plus" instruction in Spanish. As she was clear in 4.11, this kind of programming of transitional bilingual education was not "what's good for kids."

Excerpt 4.12, May 11, 2017, Madeleine on CL-628B: Initial response

1	M	This makes it seems as if you have to have a bilingual authorization to
2		teach language learners but I believe you have to have the CLAD to do
3		that. So. Then what are the differences of those? That's my first question.

Asked to define bilingual education, Xiomara distinguished between one-way, two-way, and California's history of transitional bilingual education, ending her definition at Olmeda's and Oakland Unified's goal of bilingual, biliterate students (Excerpt 4.13).

Excerpt 4.13, May 10, 2017, Xiomara on bilingual education: Bilingual biliterate students

1	X	I think that bilingual education is the idea of having two languages in a
2		classroom, however depending on what strand, you're looking at, it's a
3		lot of different things (.) so I think at our school we use a dual language
4		(.) dual immersion model. And we have a one-way 50-50 model. So to
5		me that means having 50% of the instruction in the primary language
6		with which at our school's Spanish (.) and then the 50% instruction in
7		English (.) the one-way being that we only have students with one type
8		of like language learners at our school (.) which is Spanish. So we don't
9		have a two-way model which is the half of our population is English
10		speaking and half of our population is Spanish speaking. I think that
11		**historically** bilingual education was the idea of supporting and
12		supporting a primary language speaker student but not really maintaining
13		that language. And that's initially why there was all these issues with it.
14		But I think that in **Oakland** specifically like we're working towards dual
15		

16 immersion model to really not (.) not maintain but sup**por**t and like have students who are bilingual biliterate.

Using "we," Xiomara spoke as a member of Olmeda (Lines 3, 4, 8) and also as a member of Oakland Unified (Line 14). She was careful to articulate the differences between historical bilingual education in California (Line 11) and OUSD's move away from transitional bilingual education (Lines 12-13). She, like Madeleine, articulated "dual language" (Line 3) as the path toward bilingualism and biliteracy.

District-based support: ELLMA office and New Teacher Support office. Two people working at the district level were interviewed during this study and asked almost the same questions about CL-628B. As they did not focus their work at one school, rather than asking about how they saw their own definitions of bilingual education reflected in the programming of Olmeda, they were asked about programming in Oakland Unified. Nicole Knight spoke out clearly against the language-as-problematic-resource ideology produced by CL-628B, themes with which she is familiar. Alice Holst, the district manager of new teacher support, aligned more closely to the language-as-problematic-resource orientation of CL-628B. Nicole's language is visible in language Xiomara and Madeleine used at Olmeda. As Alice's comments are the closest in alignment with language-as-problematic-resource, a brief examination of the State's and the District's documents pertaining to teacher induction is included to demonstrate how Alice aligned more closely to the contexts in which she had worked. These guidelines and standards of induction are silent on bilingual education, and Alice's responses to my questions indicated that multilingualism and bilingual education were fields that were outside her expertise – underscoring the importance of district-level work to ensure, at minimum,

collaboration with appropriate experts around any programming that impacts teachers and students in bilingual settings.

Nicole Knight, OUSD Executive Director, English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA): Rejection of antiquated notions. Though Sam and Sage mentioned they had seen the document before, Nicole was the only participant I interviewed who was already quite familiar with CL-628B. Beginning in OUSD as a bilingual teacher, she held a career-long accumulation of theory, practice, and leadership, with depth and breadth of experience that her leadership position merited. Her response in Excerpt 4.14 demonstrates her frustration with navigating misaligned federal, state, and local policies. Below, she discussed the conflict between ideologies and guidelines outlined by the State and those outlined by Oakland Unified.

Excerpt 4.14, August 4, 2017, Nicole: When is the State going to start talking to each other?

1	K	Have you paid any attention to this before?
2	N	I've seen it-> (…) I feel like some of this is really antiquated and what
3		frustrates me is (.) you know of course this was signed in 2008. But
4		we're in **2017**
5	K	=Mhmm
6	N	= and there's a new ELA/ELD framework that doesn't **ali:gn** to the
7		credentialing that we're asking (.) that we're requiring of teachers. So
8		like. When is the State going to start talking to each other? I have the
9		same issue (.) if you hear frustration in my voice because I'm frustrated.
10		I have the same issue around the federal program **monitoring** and the
11		state audits that we get that look for a very different type of ELD model
12		than what is presented in the ELA ELD framework. And I'm like, you're
13		holding us **accountable** to something that is holding us **back** from really
14		moving forward to a more visionary (.) kind of picture of what
15		instruction should look like?
16	K	=Mhmm,
17	N	=And so (.) you know as a **leader** (.) I have to think about (.) am I (.)
18		really moving to:wards (.) like an **aspirational** place of what we want to
19		create for kids? Or am I compliance driven (.) and trying to respond to
20		kind of the immediate antiquated @ kind of short term demands @ of the
21		State. So that's my reaction to it. @@

22 K Wonderful @@ Can you be more specific about **what** in this is
23 antiquated?
24 N SDAIE is what immediately (.) pops out. I mean a lot of those strategies
25 are great, and (.) I think there are (.) I think we've moved as meaning as
26 a: like (.) in our understanding, of what really moves language
27 instruction to a deeper place than SDAIE strategies? There's also (.) you
28 know **none** of the:se really speak to a (.) you know a (.) dual-language
29 type setting, whe:re we're really talking about (.) you know cross-
30 linguistic transfer and cross-cultural competence. It's kind of like (.) it
31 leads you to believe that (.) you know if I were to think oh these are the
32 type of programs that I need to have because this is what the State says
33 (.) then I'm **going** to fall into that like (.) oh I have (.) you know (.) my
34 English Learners over **here**, and the rest of the school over **here**, Or, I
35 have my bilingual strand and (.) you know
36 K =Mhmm,
37 N = We're trying to break some of those **sys**tems to really create a place
38 where (.) language is an asset for the entire community, and that's both
39 the English language, to have strong English language models (.) but
40 also of course to have other languages that can enrich the experience of
41 other students.
42 K =Mhmm
43 N So I don't see anything like that type of value, or stance (.) reflected in
44 these types of credentials.

Nicole's initial response to CL-628B calls attention to inconsistent, timely policy movement at the state level. She immediately pointed out dates of original publication (Lines 3 and 4) and called the draft "antiquated" (Lines 2 and 20). Mentioning the requirements to adhere to federal and state monitoring, Nicole drew attention to the varied paces of different offices at the state level (Lines 6-7 and 11-12). While the CCTC produces documents related to credentialing, the California Department of Education, a separate entity, produces materials related to state standards; specific to her comments, English Language Arts (ELA) and English Language Development (ELD). Nicole repeated her frustration twice in Line 9, asking "When is the State going to start talking to each other" (Line 8). As such, she indexed a District relationship of frustration with the State, a relationship that she saw as holding OUSD back (Line 14) in terms of

"aspirational" (Line 18) and "visionary" (Line 14) work. Lines 37-38, which begin with her statement, "We're trying to break some of those systems," reinforce the community focus of the ELLMA office. This community focus – multilingualism as an asset for all in the community – stood, according to her, counter to the State's division of "English Learners over here and the rest of the school over here" (Lines 33-34). All of these positions of the State Nicole resoundingly rejected, ending her response to CL-628B with, "I don't see anything like that type of value or stance [language as enrichment for all students] reflected in these types of credentials" (Line 44). Nicole's interpretation of the ideologies circulating at the state level was a clear rejection of what, to her, were antiquated notions of language and language learning.

Alice Holst, OUSD Manager of New Teacher Support: Alignment with state policy. On first glance at CL-628B, Alice Holst interpreted the document to pertain both to the CLAD and to the bilingual authorization (BCLAD), and it took some time for me to realize this. This interpretation, by someone not working daily in the realm of bilingual education – or education primarily of English Learners – speaks again to the dominance of English throughout the first page of the document. Once we clarified, in Lines 31-35, what kind of classroom instruction the document was authorizing, Alice spoke more specifically to her understanding of it and the goal that bilingual education was "getting" students to English (Excerpt 4.15, Line 51).

Excerpt 4.15, August 10, 2017, Alice on CL-628B and bilingual authorization: You want to think about getting kids to English

1	A	So **I** think that we're talking here about the CLAD. Bilingual
2		authorization as the CLAD.
3	K	Yeah. It's the current terminology for the BCLAD.
4	A	Right.
5	K	Right.

A Yeah. Right. So (.) so these (...) So if we're looking for English language development, right? So we're talking about you know that block of time when you're teaching kids (.) some **direct** (.) direct instruction in English. Right? So **primary** language development-> this is the **one** where I would say this is the **B**,

K =Mhmm->

A =in the CLAD, So **this** would be for like. You know. Basically for (...) **teachers** who have English Learners, and their classrooms, you know and are teaching them (.) to transition into English and then SDAIE, (.) strategies are you know like sheltered

K =Mhmm->

A =English strategies and but then (.) content delivered in primary language? So that's for **specifically** for like bilingual (.) classrooms. So like **I** as a non (.) you know bil- like if I was teaching a (.) third grade class and I had (.) you know like kids who were **designated** as you know <moving> (.) or if I was at a school that did **not** have bilingual instruction.

K =Mhmm->

A I couldn't (.) I don't have to speak Mandarin, and I could still have those kids and I could teach shel- I could teach SDAIE, and I could teach ELD. Even though I don't speak Mandarin. I can't teach them in their primary language.

K Right. Okay.

A Right. So there's a **distinction** there between sheltered English, and bilingual (.) instruction.

K Right. And so the bilingual:l **authorization** is putting that all together, underneath the label of a bilingual authorization.

A Right. So the **bilingual** authorization **right** is the (.) you know (.) is the (.) authorization to you know to be able to (…) teach in a bilingual classroom.

K Is that (.) when you (.) kind of have your first glance at the (.) **thi:s** description (.) does teaching in a bilingual classroom (.) stand out to you, in this definition, sort of the way this is laid out?

A What do you mean.

K Um (…) You were kind of pointing out this, these two bullets

A =Mhmm. Right these **two** bullets

K are kind of definitely relevant to teaching **bilingually** (.) but bullet one and **three** (.) those are **English** language supports. They're not biling:ual supports.

A Right. Correct. Right.

K But **all** of this is listed under the type of instruction (.) with a **bilingual** authorization.

A Yeah. Right.

K That you are authorized to teach.

A

51		Right and ideally you know (.) you **want to** teach kids you know. It's like you **want to** think about like kids getting kids to English.
52	K	Mhmm mhmm? OK. And that was my other question. What's your idea
53		of the goal of bilingual education or your definition of bilingual
54		education.
55	A	Yeah I mean like **ideally** you don't want kids to be (.) I mean you want to
56		give them **access** (.) to (.) you want to **move** them from you know like (.)
57		to be able to be **bilingual**. Right? So if they're monolingual in a language
58		other than English (.) that's **great**. You want them to be **bilingual**. You
59		want them to also be able to understand the English language.
60	K	Okay. Perfect. That's my question for everyone.
61	A	Yeah. I mean otherwise we are kind of doing them a disservice (hhh).

Fairclough's (2001) terminology is useful to consider experiential values of discourse in Alice's interpretation of CL-628B. As Alice, like Nicole, had taught and supported new teachers in OUSD for decades, examining traces of her experience of *her* world of education helps to situate her focus on English language development. As she stated, in Lines 58-61, "You want them [students] to also be able to understand the English language... Otherwise we are kind of doing them a disservice," her repeated emphasis on English matched the experience of most teachers *not* in bilingual California classrooms. California, as mentioned in Chapter 3, labels approximately 22% (around 1.3 million) of its K-12 students each year as English Learners. Alice's work in OUSD, where one in three students is labeled an English Learner, focused primarily on supporting new teachers to build their capacity to build English proficiency – not bilingually, but through "sheltered" English. Though, since he worked in a bilingual school, Wayne's minimization of the bilingual part of the authorization stands out more strongly as an erasure of the "bi" in the bilingual authorization, Alice's misinterpretation of the bilingual authorization to be the "English Learner authorization" represents the heavy emphasis on English acquisition circulating in California school systems. Taken

together, these two highly experienced urban educators in English and "English Learner" settings serve as reminders that discourses and understandings are deeply tied to experiences – yet it is not uncommon that school and district leaders move across many site-specific contexts without being expected to have a strong theoretical or practical foundation for understanding each context.

Alice referenced transitioning to English three times during her discussion of CL-628B: Lines 12-14, "So this would be for like. You know. Basically for teachers who have English Learners, and their classrooms, you know and are teaching them to transition into English", Lines 50-51, "Right and ideally... you want to think about like kids getting kids to English" and in Lines 58-61 mentioned above. At the same time, in Line 58, Alice stated clearly that speaking a language other than English was "great" – but not enough. Bilingualism, for her, in the context of K-12 education is indexed as a support of English acquisition. To be clear, nowhere in any of the California documents examined – nor in any interviews – is there any mention of languages other than English being labeled as "problems." None of the study participants, nor the producers of CL-628B, were actively working to promote the hegemony of English; Alice's response appeared to be situated in a context that considers first progress in "education" performed in English, and secondarily, the value of bilingualism and biliteracy.

Though examination of the requirements of California's teacher induction is outside the scope of this study, a brief note about them is made here. It was truly a challenge to trace the adoption and revision of California's teacher induction program standards. At the time of data collection and analysis three versions of induction standards were active on the CCTC's website, as currently accredited preparation

programs were to transition to the newest version during their next accreditation application. It appeared that there has been a biannual revision of induction standards over the past five years; optimistically, this may represent timely responses at the State dimension to issues in legislation or in school districts. However, given that an induction program for preliminarily credentialed teachers lasts two years, the rapid changes may also upset progress in establishing two-year support cycles. Regardless, there was no mention of bilingual education in any of the program materials – nor was there any mention of bilingual education in Oakland Unified's 2016-2017 *BTSA Credentialing Program Guide.* The authors of the *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards*, however, include this paragraph specific to induction:

> **The *Learning to Teach Continuum* for Bilingual Teachers**
>
> The bilingual program standards included in this document are part of the preliminary preparation of bilingual teachers. However, the extension of knowledge, skills and abilities through the induction phase of bilingual teacher preparation has not been considered in this document. According to SB 2042 (EC §44259), "a professional teaching credential is earned through completion of a two-year professional teacher induction program that begins with the candidates' initial employment as a teacher of record." Professional development for bilingual teachers in induction should include mentoring by a support provider who holds a bilingual teaching authorization. The bilingual induction phase should also include opportunities to further develop the teachers' skills using bilingual curriculum and methodologies. (CCTC, 2015b, p. 7)

Conclusion

This chapter responds to my first research question, as to how the language ideologies and language planning orientations that circulate around bilingual authorization are produced and interpreted at the state, district, school, and individual levels. In OUSD, a progressive district led by progressive administrators, there is a need to clarify the layers of context in which texts are going to be produced and interpreted, keeping in mind what messages circulate and how they may be received at multiple layers of the education community. For example, Alice had been involved with California's BTSA programs since they first evolved; it is crucial that she and other state and district-level professionals working on teacher induction become more informed of the unique skills that early-career bilingual teachers need to hone. Without explicit attention to bilingualism and biliteracy as rights and resources – not for English acquisition, but for linguistic, cultural, and social identity, cognitive advantages, and all other benefits of multilingualism, Alice's and Wayne's own professional histories ultimately connected to how others in the district and school experience professional support. While no one individual in an educational leadership position is expected to have firsthand experience in every type of instruction authorized by any one state, the experiences examined in Chapter 5 highlight a need for closer attention to context-specific support.

Returning to Ruiz' 1984 seminal essay, which used "orientation" to refer to "a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society" (p. 16), along with my use of "ideology" in its descriptive sense (neutral in nature and dependent on social experiences), the orientations people hold are determining

what is thinkable about language in society. This connects to what is thinkable about speakers of languages in society. In summary, as to how language ideologies that circulate around the bilingual authorization are produced and interpreted at multiple scales, findings indicate that the people who purposefully located their careers in bilingual settings were overall more inclined to view the use of multiple languages as rights and resources. District and Olmeda staff who had built careers in monolingual urban education, along with the drafters of legislative language visible in the CL-628B and California education code, who may not have had any professional experience as educators, expressed inclinations toward English as the most important language, and the use of any other languages to help students learn English as an appropriate way to value those other languages.

Drawing on ethnographic research in Chapter 5, I explore more deeply the experiences of Sam and Sage during BTSA, and Melisa and Wayne during PD, examining how Xiomara's and Wayne's orientations and ideologies played out in professional development at Olmeda.

Chapter 5

Ideological Intersections of Language Policy and Early-Career Teacher Professional Growth

In response to the second research question, "How do these [language] ideologies and [language planning] orientations intersect with professional development for early career teachers in one local schooling context, and what are the ramifications of these intersections?", Chapter 5 examines instances of professional growth via what may be construed as "unequal encounters" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 36) during weekly professional development meetings (PDs) and weekly BTSA coaching sessions of Sam and Sage. Close examination of interactions during these meetings revealed struggles and successes of Sage, Sam, and Melisa to grow in their professional practice. It also revealed the susceptibility of Sage and Xiomara, two vocal advocates of multilingualism, during Sage's "high stakes" BTSA inquiry task, which was taught in Spanish, to refer to students in terms of their English Learner status. More closely developed through coaching excerpts and Xiomara's interview, I concentrate on points of intersection with Xiomara's description of her own experience as a BTSA coachee, Sam's and Sage's coaching conversations, and their reflections on connections to their credentialing process and teaching practice. In addition, building on understandings articulated by Wayne in Chapter 4, language ideologies reflected during PDs themselves are analyzed. As such, I draw attention to mismatches among individual and institutional language ideologies, and how these mismatches influenced professional development – particularly, in terms of this study, to Melisa's access to meaningful professional development.

This analysis reveals the complex and sometimes conflicting work that happens in different locations, simultaneously, among actors who wield different layers of power and influence. As discussed in Chapter 3, we humans interpret and appropriate policies based on our own experiences. How Xiomara performed for her coachees is tied to her experiences in education, including being coached in BTSA and learning how to coach through leadership training in OUSD. She implied a concern that her professional reputation as a teacher-leader may have rested (in some part) on the success (or failure) of her coachees to pass BTSA, mentioning the possibility of being audited. In turn, Xiomara's coachees took up her coaching performances in ways that they understood, and in ways that served their interests. For Sage, this interest was in pushing her capacity to teach students on two ends of a spectrum of skills and understandings. For Sam, this interest was in finishing the BTSA work. Further, participants' own ideologies of language and bilingual education, examined in Chapter 4, came through the way they carried themselves in "bilingual" education professional development. Melisa tried to stay positive in response to PD meetings firmly entrenched in building, week after week, English language performance. Though willing to practice strategies developed during PDs in English and apply them in Spanish, she was the most vocal of the three early-career teachers about the lack of Spanish during dedicated PD time – and the extra burden placed upon her always to translate into Spanish what had been provided in English. She was also arguably the most deserving of bilingual-specific support, given her status as the newest teacher, teaching the most subjects (of the three) in Spanish, with the least academic and professional preparation to teach bilingually.

Chapter 5 focuses on four findings that emerged from data analysis of Olmeda meetings and interview conversations about teacher support. First, the District interprets professional growth from a "distributed leadership" (OUSD, 2015, p. 37) position, i.e., at somewhat of a distance, in order to build leadership capacity and ownership at each school site. Through intentional, concentrated work time sponsored by the District, Olmeda's ILT (Instructional Leadership Team) made decisions about site-based PD themes. However, given different interpretations and ideologies of individuals on the team, the distribution of leadership did not necessarily result, during weekly professional development meetings, in intended learning outcomes – nor necessarily match the school's stated position toward bilingualism and biliteracy. Second, pushing practice, in other words successful professional development, happened when teachers understood information at hand, believed it relevant to their practice, and then could apply their understandings. For Sam and Sage, these understandings and applications were more visible during one-on-one coaching than in PD meetings. For Melisa, the sole "successful" development during PD occurred when she too engaged in a one-on-one coaching interaction while examining and presenting subject matter she found relevant. Third, professional development that was regarded as a hoop-jumping performance – in other words, the BTSA inquiry cycle – contributed to the positioning of teachers and institutional power-wielders as "us" vs. "them." This positioning appeared counter-productive to reflective teacher practice, and while Sage for the most part could look beyond these categories, Sam struggled to grow professionally while completing what he viewed primarily as a credential requirement. Fourth, a problematic emphasis on English Learner status in bilingual education, matching emphasis in CL-628B, was evident in the

BTSA project Sam and Sage needed to pass. This project was structured very similarly to a PACT (Performance Assessment of California Teachers), and all three had completed – in English – a PACT during pre-service education. In the English-only PACT, emergent bilinguals were positioned *only* as English Learners (ELs), and attention to ELs was a required aspect of PACT planning, instruction, and assessment. Prompted by Xiomara, Sage picked up this "EL" language in her BTSA summary and incorporated the EL label into describing her students who struggled with math concepts in Spanish. Each of these findings is interpreted in turn in the following four sections. All findings address Research Question 2; the first addresses more specifically Sections a and b of Research Question 2: "How does a school district that hosts bilingual schools interpret professional growth for multiple subject (i.e., elementary teacher) bilingual authorization holders who teach in bilingual schools?" and "How does an individual bilingual elementary school interpret professional growth for bilingual teachers?" Findings 1, 3, and 4 address Section b of Research Question 2, and Findings 2, 3 and 4 address more specifically Section c of Research Question 2: "How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?" Taken collectively, these findings provide many points of departure for scholars and K-12 stakeholders to further examine in the pursuit of equitable support for bilingual education practitioners.

Finding #1: Distributed Leadership, Uneven Results

"Quality schools," according to OUSD administrative regulations, model shared decision-making and leadership "distributed through professional learning communities, collaborative planning, and individuals and teams" (OUSD, 2015, p. 37). As such,

Oakland Unified interprets professional growth from a "distributed leadership" position. Through intentional, concentrated work time sponsored by OUSD, Olmeda's ILT made decisions about site-based PD themes. However, given different interpretations and ideologies of individuals on the team, the distribution of leadership outside the team itself did not necessarily result, during weekly professional development meetings (PDs), in the ILT's intended learning outcomes. PD sessions focused on English language development and writing in English; not on bilingual pedagogies, Spanish language development, literacy in Spanish, nor on biliteracy.

During the 2016-2017 school year, every ILT meeting agenda at Olmeda included the "problem of practice" (POP) that we had crafted during Summer 2016 while participating in a week-long series of workshops specifically for OUSD bilingual elementary school ILTs. As a reminder, Madeleine, Xiomara, Wayne, and I made up four of the six ILT positions. We all participated in the Summer 2016 workshops. In the vein of distributed leadership, ILT members had agreed to focus 2016-17 PD cycles on advancing work on the POP. Olmeda's POP was as follows (Table 7):

Table 7

Olmeda Elementary Problem of Practice, 2016-2017

Foregrounding of Language Across the Curriculum: Via analysis of test scores, we have observed that students tend to plateau at an intermediate level in English. Via observation of instruction, we have noticed a pattern of teacher talk that is significantly more than student talk. Instruction often is centered around the teacher, with little opportunity for student-centered production of academic language. Academic language production demands engagement and making meaning of content and the language necessary to understand and represent understanding. In our bilingual school, this meaning making must occur both in Spanish and in English. With a high population of students labeled as English language learners, we believe that by giving time to planning around ELD/ SLD standards and putting language in the forefront, students will increase language production while having the opportunity to engage in high-quality rigorous CCSS [Common Core State Standards]-aligned tasks.

Big Idea: How do we redesign the practice of teaching in a multilingual environment?

Essential Questions:

- How do we shift from backwards planning which considers *content* as the objective toward backwards planning that explicitly foregrounds *language* as an equally weighted outcome so that students acquire academic language in both languages?
- What collaborative structures and resources can support high-quality content instruction across grade levels, especially for students labeled as English learners?

Data collection for the present study began halfway through the fourth PD cycle of the year. This cycle focused on designated and integrated ELD (English Language Development), including academic conversations (using readings from Zwiers and Crawford's *Academic Conversations: Classroom Talk That Fosters Critical Thinking and Content Understandings*) and GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Device) strategies. The last two PD cycles, each divided roughly into six weeks, closely aligned with the "foregrounding of language" goal of Olmeda's POP – in terms of ELD. As is clear in the following table (Table 8) of PD agendas and the following excerpts, the foregrounding of Spanish Language Development did not occur. While Wayne, who led all PD sessions during this study, made a brief effort (Excerpt 5.2) on May 17 to acknowledge "language learners" and not just *English* language learners, he himself was a novice in terms of thinking about instruction in a bilingual setting. Left to plan the final PD sessions on his own, Wayne was unable to provide an opportunity for Melisa to develop professionally around writing instruction in Spanish. Table 8, below, displays the goals of PD sessions that took place during this study. Four of the eight sessions explicitly reference English language or English Learners, including two of the five writing PD sessions.

Table 8

Professional Development Sessions

Date	PD Agendas: Outcomes and (if listed) Next Steps
March 22, 2017	Outcomes: I will learn about and reflect on how academic conversations can help me address integrated ELD into my content area teaching. Next Steps: Prepare a presentation on work that you did in your classroom for this cycle.
April 12, 2017	Outcomes: As a grade level, we will share our work around Language Development during this PD Cycle-especially around GLAD Strategies, Academic Conversations and ELD standards.
April 19, 2017	SBAC planning for 3-5, teaching and learning cycle planning for tK-2 (no agenda)
April 26, 2017	Outcomes: Have a firm understanding of their grade level writing standards and be able to connect the standards to the grade level below and above.
May 3, 2017	Outcomes: Reflect on ourselves as writers and our writing experiences. Review the writing process/cycle. Examine how a Bend or Bends in a Unit of Units of Study for Writing fits within the process/cycle.
May 10, 2017	Outcomes: I can use the CCSS and Units of Study Rubrics to help reflect on the current writing cycle or plan the last writing cycle whether it be from Units of Study or Content Area writing. Next Steps: To finish the Writing PD, gather student writing samples and score a "high" "medium" and "low" using the WUOS rubrics. Or bring in student drafts and discuss plan for ending Unit based on student work. Present in our last PD.
May 17, 2017	Outcomes: I can review WUOS [Writers' Units of Study] lessons and content area writing lessons and identify embedded support for EL's and places that require adaptations to better support EL's. Next Steps: To finish the Writing PD, gather student writing samples and score a "high" "medium" and "low" using the WUOS rubrics. Or bring in student drafts and discuss plan for ending Unit based on student work. Present in our last PD.
May 31, 2017	Outcomes: I have refreshed my familiarity with the California English Language Development Standards. I can review an upcoming writing lesson and identify one standard from part I: "Interacting in Meaningful Ways" and Part II: "Learning About How English Works" Next Steps: To finish the Writing PD, gather student writing samples and score a "high" "medium" and "low" using the WUOS rubrics. Or bring in student drafts and discuss plan for ending Unit based on student work. Present in our last PD. You might include your work

around the CCSS, the ELD standards, accommodations for language learners, and any other successes, struggles or insights to your efforts.

After meeting on April 11, ILT members (including Wayne) left with a rough sketch of the first two weeks of the "writing" PD cycle, the final cycle of the year. Unknown to us at the time, this would be the last ILT meeting that Wayne would attend. On April 25, the ILT met without him and planned the Cycle 5: Day 1 (April 26) session that Wayne would lead. The final ILT meetings of the year focused on wrapping up calendars and planning for the following school year, not on planning PD sessions. Wayne independently planned the weekly PDs after April 26. With an unclear final meeting date and an unclear culminating "writing" goal for the teachers, a general sense of discombobulation grew over the course of the final four weeks of PDs; as did the proportion of "teacher talk" (identified in our POP as disproportionate to student talk) generated by Wayne. Asked a week after school ended how he felt about how PDs had ended, he replied – after an immediate "Shitty" and then laughter by both of us – "I didn't feel great about that." We discussed the writing cycle, and Wayne offered his perspective on how he had planned each session after the first was planned without him[15] (Excerpt 5.1).

Excerpt 5.1 June 12, 2017, Wayne on PD: "What did we agree to now?"

1	W	And so the next day I just came in and I was like. I don't even remember
2		what we said we were doing? Like you said (.) I looked back at the ILT
3		notes and I was like I don't remember (…) then we switched (…) and
4		then the week before we changed completely! So I didn't know if what
5		was on the ILT notes was going to follow? So I was like (.) that doesn't
6		make sense to me we switched it so what did we agree to no::w? So I

[15] Attached in the Appendix are Tables 5 and 6, which include the notes of these two meetings. These are the notes that Wayne referenced when planning the remainder of the writing sessions.

> just kind of did stuff I just made up stuff that **I** thought was important. I said "What do you guys think"? And they are always too busy to really (…) I don't know like "Yeah it's great".

According to Wayne's comments above, to plan and implement each of the five writing sessions, beginning April 26, he relied on the April 26 agenda created by the ILT (minus him), the sets of notes from ILT agendas – included as Tables 5 and 6 in the appendix – and what *he* thought was important. In our interview on May 10, Wayne talked about how his CLAD coursework had helped broaden his capacity to coach around language. He stated, "I do think because of my CLAD certification I do have an awareness of a lot of this, more than I did before... It helps me have a different conversation with them [teachers] about certain kids because of the second language thing or because of the primary language."

Though able to state that his CLAD coursework had helped broaden his awareness of "the second language thing," this exposure may not yet have been entrenched deeply enough to guide Wayne on his own to plan a cycle of writing-specific PD sessions in a bilingual school. The positioning of a seasoned teacher of writing (in English only) into a leadership position to plan, solo, writing PD (in a bilingual school) resulted in a focus on what "he" thought was important and, I would argue, on what Wayne knew how to do well – teach writing in English. Though he made a somewhat awkward attempt during the May 17 session to acknowledge "all" language learners (see Excerpt 5.2, below), if Wayne was indeed drawing on his recent coursework as building awareness of instructional strategies to support English Learners, he still indexed discomfort with "the second language thing." Excerpt 5.2 contains some of the introduction to the May 17 session where Wayne spoke, uninterrupted, for two and a half

minutes. Two portions of his introduction are included to demonstrate both the goal of his self-planned session and the language he used to show his awareness and support of the fact that not all teachers present during the PD taught writing in English. Written on the agenda, the stated outcomes of the day were "I can review WUOS [Lucy Calkins' Writing Units of Study] lessons and content area writing lessons and identify embedded support for EL's and places that require adaptations to better support EL's (*sic*)." In his oral introduction, Wayne modified the expectations so that team teachers would look at both teachers' writing lessons (English and Spanish) and fine-tune language supports for both languages.

Excerpt 5.2 May 17, 2017, PD: "Language Learners" day

1	W	OK our outcome today is, I can review Writing Units of Study lessons
2		and content-area writing lessons and identify embedded support for, I'm
3		going to say **language** learners, not English language learners, because
4		we have more than just English language learners and place, and places
5		that require scaffolding and adaptation to better support language
6		learners (…) So we **are** going to dive in a **little** bit today to Lucy's
7		Writing Units of Study? This gives us the opportunity, those of us who
8		are not teaching it (.) the opportunity to take a closer look at it, it gives
9		those of you who **are** teaching it an opportunity to think with a thought
10		partner, your grade-level colleague, or colleagues, about how it's
11		working for you and your kids arou::nd (.) language learners and what
12		supports are in there->what supports (…) you **are** making regularly? or
13		that you haven't really thought about that you:: **now** would like to try,
14		based on you guys working together?
15	W	... So sort of **think** for a moment about (.) what it means to be a language
16		learner-> we have all have been a language learner in some capacity in
17		our life, I guess just a lot probably, and thinking of your students (...) I'd
18		like you to take a few moments to think about the kinds of struggles that
19		language learners have while writing, either in **their** language or another
20		language and the kinds of things **you** do or know you **can** do to support
21		them with that struggle or those struggles.

A closer analysis of Wayne's speech highlights the circular style (Lines 20-21 "you do/you can do, that struggle or those struggles") he engaged in to talk around

something that he had been prepared, both via his coaching network in OUSD and in his CLAD coursework, to focus on – identifying embedded English language support in a curriculum – in other words, integrated ELD. In the moment of reading the written agenda's intended outcome, Wayne appeared to catch his "EL-only" reference and attempted to amend it (Line 3 of 5.2). However, this last-minute change likely affected how Wayne would present the activities of the day (Lines 6-14). As Wayne continued to talk through (and possibly plan in the moment) how two grade-level partners, most of whom taught writing in either Spanish or English (not both), would collaborate to focus on necessary language supports, he began to stumble. He repeated the phrase "language learner" five times in the first 14 lines, and then again three more times in the following seven lines. This repetition reinforced his discomfort and his uncertainty, as did his use of "or" as a discourse connector - "what supports you are making regularly or that you haven't really thought about that you now would like to try," "kinds of things you do or know you can do," "to support them with that struggle or those struggles" (Lines 20-21). It was no secret that Wayne spoke only English, so by discursively including himself in that "we have all been a language learner" (Line 16) – and then following this phrase with a hesitation marker, "I guess just a lot probably," he distanced himself from every other person in the room in terms of language-learning/writing in a second language experiences. This distance served to remind the teachers that Wayne was an outsider in terms of understanding what it really meant for both the teachers and their students to be developing as bilingual writers. Further, his reference in Line 19 to "**their** language" signaled his monolingual understanding of language – that only one language could belong to a person. Wayne's speech may have been received as clueless, irritating, or

further, insulting. When Melisa reflected, in Line 3 of Excerpt 5.3, below, "I'm not sure if it's **who** is presenting the information, or if I'm just…" she signaled discomfort with some aspect of Wayne's performance that day. Wayne's attempt to integrate "beyond" ELD and the Lucy Calkins materials, using resources immediately available to him, didn't quite play out at each grade level, as a large-group discussion of when to prioritize mechanics and English/Spanish orthographies dominated the 15 minutes after his introduction. To move the group back into his agenda, Wayne spoke for another four minutes, uninterrupted, then passed out (from his network of literacy coaches) what he called an OUSD cheat sheet, created to build supports for English Learners (only) into each portion of Writing Units of Study lessons (taught in English). After asking "What are your questions about what we're going to do for the next bit of time," to which he received silence, Wayne said, "No questions. Beautiful. Okay. Off to work."

A phenomenon that many of us have cringed through, either in the audience or as the over-talker, and one identified in the Olmeda POP – too much "teacher talk," is often connected to instances of discomfort. Perhaps this discomfort arises from lack of preparation or lack of understanding of subject matter. Regardless, Wayne's over-talking, in addition to absence of Spanish-specific support, ended with Melisa stating that she didn't gain any utility from the session. Because Sam taught writing in English and did think about his students in terms of English proficiency, he was most able to use the OUSD handout as well as the supports that were written into Lucy Calkins' materials. Sage, who taught writing in both Spanish and English, depending on the time of year, reflected that she took the day's session to work with her partner on Spanish writing. In this way, she (and her partner) moved past Wayne's introduction and chose to work,

regardless of the agenda, in a way that would be meaningful to them. Melisa, again with the least preparation of the three, and who relied only on the PD sessions for professional growth that year, continued to express frustration and discouragement (Excerpt 5.3).

Excerpt 5.3, May 17, 2017, Melisa PD Reflection: "Kind of a bummer"

M I think that the PD, that PD was a little confusing to me. Honestly, I think that the way the information is being presented, it's not very clear on what we're supposed to be doing for PD. I'm not sure if it's **who** is presenting the information, or if I'm just (...) I'm just lost with writing. I have felt that I struggled with Lucy Calkins' writing mini lessons all year, just for the fact that (...) I need to translate everything, and not everything from English to Spanish writing translates very easily. So I was hoping that this PD would be a little bit more **helpful** and useful (...) But I just, I didn't find it too useful, honestly. Not useful in the sense where I can (...) Where it can be used in the classroom, and just thinking for next year, so that was kind of a bummer.

Even though Wayne had spoken in a manner that was confusing and frustrating to me as well, Melisa didn't place all the blame of her confusion on him. Instead, she hesitated to do so, and offered herself up for blame as well: "I'm not sure if it's who…or if I'm just lost…I struggled…all year" (Lines 3-5). This willingness to believe that the "leader" had something important to teach, no matter how much his language revealed his own struggles, is perhaps not unusual given that every teacher stumbles sometimes and deserves a bit of forgiveness. However, a Faircloughian consideration of the social conditions of Wayne's discourse production and social conditions of Melisa's interpretation resulted in a context where Melisa walked away from a PD session, at least in part, questioning her own capacity to learn along with thinking that her struggles to teach had not been addressed.

Melisa expressed her frustration at the English-only focus during PDs during multiple reflections and during her interviews. Her reflection after the May 3 PD session

took place the morning after the PD session, at the beginning of our interview. The relaxed and bi-directional nature of our relationship and conversation likely influenced the stronger language Melisa used here. Excerpt 5.4 highlights the injustice she felt in connection to the absence of support in Spanish.

Excerpt 5.4 May 3, 2017 Melisa PD Reflection: "What about our Spanish teachers"

1	M	But it's just like I honestly think that it's **really** unfair that all of our PDs
2		are in English? And what about our **Spanish** teachers? Like great! I'm
3		**glad** that I'm getting these PDs on writing and reading and math and
4		science or whatever. It's like the only thing I can use of what you pull out
5		for me like straight from what you give me, is just math. Cuz that's the
6		only thing I teach in English. Everything else I teach in Spanish, so all of
7		the resources that you give me, I have to **translate** them! You know? So
8		it's just like, it's not the **same**. So I told her [Xiomara], you know what?
9		For next year, I was just like, the PDs need to be in both languages. Like
10		because it's very unfair. Or separate the Spanish with the English.
11		Because it's not fair to us that we don't get any resources, but all the
12		English teachers do. Like that's **not** cool. Like not one PD have we had
		in Spanish.

As a first-year teacher, Melisa said the support she needed was professional development in Spanish. While she could tell Xiomara what changes she thought needed to be made for the following year, "PDs need to be in both languages" (Line 9), Melisa's growing feelings of frustration and injustice were sentiments that she believed included more than just her – "what about our other Spanish teachers?" The extra burden of translating curriculum from English into the language of instruction, a problem that bilingual teachers have articulated for decades, added to English-only professional development, reinforced the extra burden she felt – which in turn contributed to Melisa positioning justice and injustice along the lines of language.

Returning to the question of how both a school district and an individual school interpret professional growth, Olmeda Elementary was supported by OUSD with time,

space, and importantly, trust, to envision and articulate goals "to redesign the practice of teaching in a multilingual environment" and foreground "academic language in both languages" (Olmeda Problem of Practice). However, Olmeda's PD sessions, at least during the period of this study, did not support teachers to grow in any language of instruction other than English. They were planned mostly by the ILT member newest to OUSD, Olmeda, and bilingual education. As such, access to the ILT's goal of strengthening "academic language in both languages" was limited. This uneven result of distributed leadership was not the intended outcome of OUSD or Olmeda, yet PD only in English about English logically results in, at best, strengthening of pedagogical language knowledge of English. This, in turn, reinforces the value attached to English at the same time silencing, literally, voices in Spanish. While this first finding is in response to how a district and bilingual school interpret PD for bilingual teachers, next follows a response to how early-career teachers experience PD.

Finding #2: "Pushing Practice" Happens When Teachers Work in Their ZPD

This section addresses section c of Research Question 2: "How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?" Below, I focus on the second finding that emerged from the data – that "pushing practice," in other words, successful professional development, happened when teachers valued the matter at hand and could simultaneously understand and apply their understandings in meaningful ways. Though not without critique, (cf. Chaiklin, 2003) this "common interpretation" (p. 41) of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) is useful in this study to apply terminology familiar throughout the field of education to

what OUSD members call "pushing practice." These instances of success were visible primarily during one-on-one interactions, when both parties were engaged with each other and the material at hand. During group PD sessions, it was often the case that group dynamics, including off-topic side conversations, interrupted opportunities to reflect on or refine understandings around curriculum and instruction. The following excerpts demonstrate how opportunities to push practice were variably experienced by Melisa, Sam, and Sage. Because Sam and Sage, preliminary credential holders, were required by the state and district to participate in a BTSA program, they received many more opportunities for one-on-one support than Melisa, whose emergency credential was not recognized among state or district guidelines as a qualifier for any specific support; therefore, she received no district- or school-allocated one-on-one support. Wayne, Olmeda's monolingual-English instructional coach, was not able to observe and coach Melisa, as she taught primarily in Spanish. As a result, consistent opportunities for professional growth for Melisa lay only in PD sessions.

Melisa: "Just right" PD to build knowledge and engagement. For Melisa, the sole successful PD session she reflected on occurred when she engaged in a one-on-one coaching interaction while exploring subject matter she found relevant. As a nod to Lucy Calkins and the Reading and Writing Project, whose curriculum Olmeda teachers were beginning to implement, I label the successful April 26 PD session as a "just right" session. This was during the first of the writing cycle sessions, and the only PD session during this study that was collaboratively planned by most ILT members. Wayne was absent for this planning. The session's goal, stated in Table 8, was for teachers to "[h]ave a firm understanding of their grade level writing standards and be able to connect the

standards to the grade level below and above." During the session, grade-level teams examined California Common Core State Standards for writing, created posters that provided an overview of their grade-level expectations, presented their posters to the other faculty – and then in addition collected notes on a shared document that identified links to each grade prior and post-grade level. What ensued was an energetic conversation about Olmeda expectations – and alignment to Common Core – of writing in English, Spanish, and specifically the "weaker" of each student's language. The conversation was so energetic that teachers requested the session extend beyond the "contract" end time. Due to the majority of voices belonging to non-study participants, this conversation itself was not transcribed. However, the excitement and relevance of that meeting was mentioned in the rest of Melisa's weekly reflections on the writing cycle – and carried through the next year into my own design of PD sessions for other schools. Though Xiomara and Melisa, when preparing their own poster and presentation, did not specifically discuss writing in a particular language, they did engage in what I would label a coaching conversation, wherein Xiomara pushed Melisa to present their poster information, supporting her to rehearse before presenting in front of the other faculty. Their rehearsal, initiated by Melisa's question to Xiomara, asking her if she was going to present their poster, led to Xiomara pushing Melisa to be the presenter because this was something, according to Xiomara, that Melisa "need[ed] to work on." Xiomara initiated the practice round, and after listening to her describe their poster, Melisa explained the same information, getting feedback along the way. As such, Melisa was actively engaged with the material she was learning at the same time she was getting real-time feedback on her demonstration of understanding. She and her partner collaborated

on creation of a poster, her partner practice-presented their poster, Melisa listened, and then she practice-presented the poster. As their time to get ready ran down, Xiomara made a point to call out to the principal that she and Melisa were ready, and that they "even practiced." This is the only occurrence of rehearsal that I observed during all PD sessions. The applause and compliments at the end (Lines 21-22, Excerpt 5.5) reinforced the effort made refining their presentation.

Excerpt 5.5 April 26, 2017, Melisa PD: Just-right PD

1	M	This is our poster so-> I think a pattern we can see is every grade builds
2		onto the other grades? One thing that we found (.) 4th graders are (.)
3		supposed to be able to do an op**in**ion piece (.) informative explanatory
4		piece (.) and a narrative piece? One thing that we found is that (.)
5		everything in the opinion piece, so introduce and state an opinion
6		**clear**ly, organizational **struc**ture, details and facts to sup**port** reasons use
7		(.) linking words and concluding language? can be found in all **three** of
8		them? OK? Um (.) Something that we found in the informative and
9		explanatory different from:: the other ones is that they should be able to
10		develop (.) with facts and details? (.) Preci::se-> They should be able to
11		use precise language and domain specific **words** and linking (.) phrases
12		together? Something that makes the narrative a little bit different from
13		the other two, (.) is:: use dialogue and description (.) language, use
14		transitional words to show the sequence? A::nd use (.) sensory details.
15		(Yeah.)
16	X	Then for all three of the genres (.) they need to be able to write multiple
17		paragraphs? (.) that are organized for the structure, (.) they need to revise
18		and edit with peers, and (.) that's kind of going along with the writing
19		process that 3rd grade mentioned. And then use technology to conduct
20		short research projects (.) and **para**phrase digital or print resources.
21		(...)(Applause)
22	Sam	All right.

In Line 15 (Excerpt 5.5), Xiomara jumped in to build past what Melisa didn't have time to practice, removing the possibility of any potential stumbles Melisa may have made. This scripting and rehearsal style matches how Xiomara described her own lesson planning. She is the only person I have ever met who, after so many years of teaching,

scripts her entire lessons, placing them on the Google drive to be accessed and revised year after year. This practice extended to her team planning with Melisa during 2016-17. Because Xiomara and Melisa were the sole fourth grade teachers, they met frequently to plan instruction. The informal coaching example during the April 26 PD is indicative of their comfort with each other, as well as their informal coach-coachee relationship. Even for a two-minute share-out, whether the audience be students or colleagues, Xiomara modeled the utility of rehearsing before going in front of an audience. Melisa received only positive reinforcement of this practice, as is evident above. During her reflection, below (5.6), Melisa didn't specifically articulate how Xiomara's support may have helped her access and apply understanding of the sequence of standards, but she did speak more positively about this session than any other during the period of this study. Outside April 26, Melisa's reflections centered around two themes – what she wished she would have been able to do during the sessions, and the overwhelming presence of English and lack of Spanish. (See, for example, Excerpts 5.3 and 5.4, above.)

Excerpt 5.6 April 26, 2017, Melisa PD Reflection: "Very helpful"

1	M	Today's PD-> which was the first day of our writing cycle, I actually **do**
2		think that it was **very** helpful for my teaching in the classroom right
3		now? I wish this PD would have been at the beginning of the year
4		because we kind of saw(...)Just wha::t we are supposed to, what the **kids**
5		are supposed to be able to write. Such as like the **writing** process as you
6		know. The types of (...) of papers they're supposed to be able (.) to write
7		by the end of the **year**. And not only did we see it in 4th grade but we
8		saw it all across all grades, so that was really helpful to see just like how
9		they start in kindergarten and that kind of every year builds on? So I
10		**really** enjoyed this PD. And I hope for like this writing process it:: or for
11		this writing cycle of our PDs (.) I continue to see more useful things that
12		I can use, implement in the classroom.

Melisa used the words "helpful" and "useful" (5.6, Lines 2, 8, and 11) to describe her thoughts about this PD. She also said she "really enjoyed" it (Line 10). Whether the sense of enjoyment arose from some combination of dedicated time to read, discuss, and contextualize standards, from the positive coaching interaction she had with Xiomara, from positive feedback after she and Xiomara presented to the larger group, from the group-wide conversation about writing expectations in Spanish, or from a combination thereof, Melisa found utility in this session. She was poised to learn and practice more "useful things" in terms of writing instruction. This enthusiasm stood in contrast to her reflection (Excerpt 5.4) the following week, as well as to her reflections on the rest of the PD sessions. On April 26, Melisa engaged actively in material that she deemed important and applied her understandings in a way that was meaningful to her. Further, she refined her understanding via rehearsal and one-on-one support of this rehearsal – and received positive reinforcement from the larger group. In these ways, Melisa was able to deepen her understanding of California writing standards and thereby situate her own instruction. She was operating within her ZPD and excited to build her capacity to teach writing in Spanish.

BTSA. Before examining interactions during BTSA coaching sessions as they relate to Finding #2, I first provide some background on Sage's and Sam's BTSA "inquiry cycles." Prior to Julia's maternity leave at the end of March, which coincided with Spring Break, Julia, Xiomara, and Sage met and planned the inquiry cycle that Sage would complete with Xiomara stepping in as her BTSA coach. Sage began drafting the written pieces of the project during her spring break. All coaching meetings I observed, then, beginning April 11 (the second day after the end of Spring Break, one month before

the project's due date), focused on drafting elements of this written project. Sage's inquiry focused on a daily small-group intervention with five students who, according to Sage's data collection and analysis, were unable to access whole-class math lessons because of a gap in foundational math understandings (place value of ones and tens). As Sage demonstrated in her conversations about these students' work and her planning and instruction – as well as in her final written "synthesis of learning"– a summary of the inquiry project, including an introduction with contextual description of the class, plans for instruction, and baseline data – and then summary of instruction, post-instruction assessment, and plans for next steps – this targeted small-group instruction (contrasted with her previous unsuccessful efforts simply to reteach the large-group lessons) was successful, in that students demonstrated, via assessment and observation, mastery of the foundational understandings she focused on during the small-group interventions. Sam's inquiry project focused on a weekly small-group reading intervention, with a goal to move students from one reading level to another. Though he stated in his project that his intervention was successful, it was difficult to see evidence of student progress, as Sam did not provide pre- and post-intervention reading scores – something that was readily measurable at Olmeda. Sage's coaching sessions with Xiomara were consistently positive every week – whether discussing Sage's planning/instruction/assessment/writing up of her project, or discussing with humor and love their students' behavior, academic performance, and siblings. In contrast, Sam's coaching sessions with Xiomara focused primarily on supporting the drafting and completion (what often felt like an extraction) of his inquiry project.

Sage: Reflective practice to strengthen pedagogy. In her reflections, Sage repeatedly discussed how she was growing in terms of her ability to target instruction to her students' needs. This reflective thread revolved broadly around differentiating for students based on their zone of proximal development (ZPD) in large-group and small-group instruction; not focusing solely on struggling learners but also on students who exceeded expectations. This second group were children Sage vocally worried about even though her BTSA project targeted the lowest-performing students. Her pedagogical practice gained "research" clout during the April 25 BTSA coaching session. During this session, 12 days before Sage's final project was due, Xiomara and Sage engaged in a lengthy, collaborative meeting discussing her inquiry project. In the following excerpt (5.7), Sage and Xiomara were discussing a requirement of the project – citation of relevant research to support decision-making. Xiomara began this discussion asking Sage if she had "happened" to read any of the resources Xiomara had offered her since their last meeting two weeks prior. Sage replied that she had – and that she had purchased one of the resources because it "looked really comprehensive." Referencing one of the articles they had both read, Xiomara stated, "Pretty much everything that you're doing, it says this is what you should do in a differentiated math class and I was like, 'Sweet. Winning'." Xiomara continued to compliment both Sage and her prior coach on setting up the inquiry cycle well and repeated how this article connected nicely to what Sage was doing in her classroom.

Excerpt 5.7 April 25, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sage): "That's a next level situation"

1	X	It does also talk about choice and thinking about, so this talks about the
2		ZPD for students and what they're doing back here. I thought that really
3		touched nicely on what you're actually doing. You're still doing the

standard based essential concepts that you're doing in front of the whole class, but then you're breaking it down at a level that they need. But you're not going (.) you're still teaching them the concept but at their level. I think that's what this article is talking about (.) doing that (.) and why that's important. And then it talked about (…) it's so great (.) you and Julia really set up your cycle **really** well. It also talks about doing the pre-assessment to figure out what your kids need. So you're on it with that as well. Then it kind of goes into like what other (.) like gives some suggestions of how else you can differentiate in your class which when I read it I was like **ooh** just to have that preplanned out and the capacity in your class, I was like **ooh** that's a **next level** situation.

Both positive reinforcements by a new coach and connections to "best practice" carry weight, especially for early-career teachers, and it is clear in Sage's reflection (below, 5.8) that she felt the positivity. To have someone, whose teaching she regarded well, in a position of power, compliment Sage on a "next level situation" laid a foundation of professional goodwill. These sorts of interactions could only help Sage continue to be invested in her practice. Sage, via her consistent reflections and refinement, did appear ready for a "next level situation," which meant her coach could *both* tick the BTSA boxes and observe and coach Sage within *her* ZPD. Sage was able to take into consideration her coach's concrete example of how she might apply differentiation to her whole class and not just the small group she was focusing on during the BTSA tasks. Sage left the meeting feeling positive. Her reflection follows: (5.8)

Excerpt 5.8 April 25, 2017, Sage BTSA reflection: "Really excited"

Sg I'm really excited at the (.) idea of continuing to put into place things that will be **really** (.) relevant to what my student needs are. And also I think pushing myself in whole group instruction to differentiate? (.) I think that's also a big next step for me, and a big aspiration (.) and which is kind of part of what Xiomara brought up (...) I would really (.) love @ to be able to do that (.) and especially like I said challenge (.) my really **high** kids. I don't feel like I **do** them (.) justice and give them everything that **they** need (.) to meet **their** zone of proximal development. I don't

10 want them to be challenge averse because everything is (.) too **easy** for them. I don't feel like that's doing them any kind of service at **all** really.

All of Sage's coaching meetings I observed were full of positive reinforcement such as "that's a next level situation" – even when discussing the ups and downs of her days; her post-coaching comments reflected the same sort of excitement. Not only was she able to see the relevance of the BTSA project in supporting what her student needs were (Line 2, 5.8), she aspired to push herself (Lines 3 and 4). In each coaching meeting, Sage initiated discussions of teaching events that she wanted to improve. Rather than avoid her struggles, she took her own "big step[s]," demonstrating how she also wasn't "challenge-averse."

Xiomara on BTSA coaching and pushing practice. During her interview on May 10, two days before the final BTSA project was due, Xiomara discussed with me her experiences both as a BTSA coach and as a BTSA participant. Excerpt 5.9 is included as a background to my interpretation of how Xiomara's history may have informed her interactions with Sage and Sam.

Excerpt 5.9 May 10, 2017, Xiomara on BTSA: Pushing practice

1 X Because I wanted to push myself. So I did (.) the **two** years in BTSA
2 wa::s very (.) annoying because I felt like they were (...) it was **busy**
3 work. I didn't feel like in general I go::t much out of it other than like (...)
4 asking like having Madeleine push me and in ways that BTSA wasn't
5 really asking (...) us to do. So I was like trying to think (.) on a weekly
6 basis how can I have this expert **teacher** help me with this week... I
7 didn't feel like they [BTSA assignments] pushed my practice as a
8 **teacher** but **she** did you know what I mean? We managed to work out a
9 relationship where it was like (.) well how can you make me a better
10 teacher anyway @@ regardless of these BTSA assignments.

Both Xiomara and Sage spoke of wanting to push themselves (Lines 1, 4-7, 5.9 and Line 3, 5.8). Considering Xiomara's professional disposition toward pushing

practice, it is perhaps not surprising that Sage's requests to be observed - outside of the confines of the BTSA assignment – were requests that Xiomara gladly accepted. This natural sort of alignment of styles benefitted both coach and coachee. Xiomara discussed coaching Sage during the previous five weeks, while reflecting on the progress she had made during the previous year and a half. It was natural that she would compare the two teachers she was now coaching, as well as compare herself as a coach to Sage's previous coach (and Xiomara's previous teaching partner), Julia. (5.10)

Excerpt 5.10 May 10, 2017, Xiomara on coaching Sage: Look what coaching and hard work can do

1	X	Working with Sage I didn't **know** what to expect with my first meeting
2		with her (...) becau::se she's been working with Julia (.) you know for a
3		year and a **half**. And Julia's fan**tas**tic? So it was actually kind of like
4		nerve-wracking like **oh no** @@@ I'm gonna be so bad...@@ But it
5		makes me feel like I'm not horrible @@ which is great cause I feel a
6		little bit horrible with Sam and I feel like okay maybe I'm not the world's
7		worst coach in the world working with Sage because she (.) And I had
8		the opportunity to observe her (.) multiple times last year and just to see
9		the leaps and bounds that she has made like a::s a teacher is **incredible**
10		and so I'm like applauding Julia to **death** because I don't know how
11		much of that is just growing and learning or like coaching from
12		Madeleine or coaching from Julia or whoever has supported her this
13		whole time just for me it shows like **whoah**. Look at what coaching can
14		do for a person. And hard work. Cause I think she's a **very** hard worker.
15		And so my approach is just very different with her because I could see
16		right away (.) that she didn't need a directive approach and was **super**
17		reflective? And that she (.) knows how to ask questions to get support.
18		And I think that's a big thing… Sage **knows** that she can ask for support?
19		Because that's going to make her better and stronger. And so (.) I think
20		she's very purposeful of like what she asks and what she means and she
21		thinks that through before our meetings. And so that's really nice.

In Lines 17-21, 5.10, Xiomara discussed what she viewed as Sage's strength – that reflecting and purposefully asking for support meant they could use their coaching times to push Sage's ZPD. This coach-coachee relationship, combined with a task that

Sage stated was relevant to her classroom, in other words, a task she was willing and capable of meaningfully engaging in, set the stage for many "really nice" (Line 21, above) encounters. This similarity between Sage and Xiomara, while beneficial for Sage, may inadvertently have served as a tool to distinguish Sam from Sage.

Sam: Task completion to meet requirements. When I asked Xiomara if she had observed Sam that spring, she said she had not because "he didn't ask." Xiomara's collaborative, collegial conversations with Sage stood in contrast to the task-completion atmosphere I observed during Sam's coaching sessions. Though Sage, as Xiomara said, had already made "leaps and bounds" (Line 9, 5.10) of progress as a teacher, Xiomara was concerned that she wasn't "actually" helping Sam (Line 5, 5.11). For a teacher leader truly committed to improving pedagogy – who not only painstakingly planned her own instruction but also, during a coaching session with Sam talked about how, for years, she videoed her classroom and examined the videos with Julia to refine her practice – she was frustrated by her perception that BTSA tasks interrupted the establishment of an ideal coaching situation. (5.11)

Excerpt 5.11 May 10, 2017, Xiomara on coaching Sam: "It's such a time crunch"

1	X	I feel like [the structure of the cycle of inquiry] it's such a (.) it's such a
2		time crunch that I can't even (.) **push** him to be more reflective because
3		we need to get this stuff done (.) But it has been overall a **very**
4		frustrating experience working with him because I don't feel like I have
5		actually **helped** him. And that (.) doesn't make **me** feel good.

The first meeting I observed between Sam and Xiomara was on April 21, ten days after the first of two Sage-Xiomara sessions I had observed, and 15 instructional days before the project was due. At that point, Sam appeared stalled in starting the planning and instruction that would be the focus of this cycle, and the coaching sessions up to his

final submission on May 12 focused much more heavily on completing the requirements of the project, as opposed to performing well as a teacher and sharing that experience via the project. Although I was present for the April and May coaching sessions of this inquiry cycle, even at the end of the project, I was unclear as to which students were in Sam's intervention group and what the course of their progress was. Sage and Xiomara discussed the students in Sage's intervention each week; Sam and Xiomara did not. From the beginning of the first coaching session I observed, Sam was behind schedule. During a meeting three weeks before Spring Break, which I did not observe, he and Xiomara had decided that Sam would work once a week with a small group of students scoring between 3.4 and 4.0 on STAR reading tests, the equivalent of "Level P" (Fountas and Pinnell). This is a reading level considered to be equivalent to the end of third grade. The first ten minutes of the April coaching session focused on how the previous two weeks post-Spring Break had gone with regard to classroom management, as student behavior was what Sam had identified as limiting his ability to be productive with the small group. Xiomara offered reminders such as posting expectations, using incentives, and frequent monitoring. Six and a half minutes into this conversation, Sam got up to look for something to take notes with and began writing down her suggestions. This somewhat late start to notetaking was commented on jokingly by Xiomara. After an additional suggestion to Sam on how to use a behavior check during silent reading time, she then shifted to the content of his instruction. Excerpt 5.12, below, shows how Xiomara tried to guide Sam into a similar differentiation model (instruction targeted to meet students within their ZPD) as the one that Sage was using successfully. The "research" source she refers to is Fountas and Pinnell's *Continuum of Literacy,2nd edition* (2007), a book that all

Olmeda teachers had as a resource, had used during a reading PD cycle earlier in the year, and that Xiomara and Sam had verbally decided (in March) that he would use to inform his small group intervention.

Excerpt 5.12 April 21, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sam): You and We

X So when you're **with** them, what is the bulk of your:: focus.

Sam Trying to (...) like (.) do whatever the Lucy lesson is, but just with more support and. (structure). Like if we're doing theme, they'll have to (.) discuss themes and then go back and (.) pick out evidence? for the themes.

X (...) So (...) They have all read like a chapter and then let's say your Lucy lesson is on (.) are you guys on fiction?

Sam Fiction yeah.

X Well let's say it's on, you know, character development. You've already done your mini lesson in front of the whole class and now you're with your small group? So (.) what modifications or what scaffolding are you providing extra for certain lessons. And then whatever those **are** (.) like how are we keeping track of that. Cause you need to have all that-> written **down** for the cycle of inquiry.

Sam (...) I mean. Well I give sentence frames for everyone to use (.) if they need it (...) And then. I mean when I **meet** with the group I'm kind of helping them:: along. Bu::t (...) I don't know.

X =OK

Sam I don't know if I'm offering more than that.

X =Okay. I think my suggestion is that (.) you are saying for the cycle of inquiry that (.) you are going to use a continuum of literacy? to push them to the next level right.

Sam =Mhmm.

X =So our goal is to have them **in**crease their reading level and so. **My** suggestion? And you can tell me what you **think** is to like (.) **not** reiterate what Lucy's teaching?

Sam =Mhmm.

X =Because it might not be actually what they need

Sam =Mhmm.

X =in that small group (.) but think about what is in the continuum of literacy. That it says what's going to push them from one letter to the next letter. Like which focus? foci (.) are you going to **choose** from each one before reading the remaining and like beyond the text reading sections? Which one of those skills do **those kids** actually need that they're not doing well? So you can focus in on **those** skills. For that chapter.

Sam And then the rest of the groups can work on the Lucy stuff.

X [Yeah. On the Lucy lessons.

38		**Our** goal is to **move** them. You know? So (.) according to the **research**
39		we (.) are going to cite, we're saying "These are the things we need to
40		do" so I think we should be more explicit about doing those things. So. I
41		would like to see (.) like as you're (.) either planning your small group?
42		Thinking about those three (.) like **focus** areas and like what are the
43		different big chunks you're going to focus on with that small group.
44		Because we need to be super systematic like "This is what we tried. This
45		is what we (.) really **taught** to the kids" and either yes they grew:: like
46		this said they were going to do or they **didn't**. You know what I mean?
47		What do you think.
48	Sam	Yeah, I think that's a good idea.

In this excerpt, Xiomara moved between using "you" and "we" to narrate Sam's instruction and BTSA task requirements. During the first 13 lines of 5.12, she used "you/your" nine times before shifting to "we," "how are we keeping track of that" (Line 11). After this initial switch, Xiomara immediately moved back to "you," telling Sam "You need to have all that written down for the cycle of inquiry." The continued shifts back and forth stand out as both a marker of Xiomara's natural tendency to collaborate and as markers of her attempts to remain in a "directive" coaching style, attempting discursively to force Sam to take more responsibility for his project. Each use of "we" (Lines 3, 39, 40, 44, 45) referred to sample language Sam could use to answer BTSA questions. In response to Sam's admittance of uncertainty about how to provide targeted support (Line 16), Xiomara kept the conversation focused on how to write up the BTSA tasks: "I think my suggestion is that you are saying for the cycle of inquiry, that you are going to use a continuum of literacy to push them to the next level, right?" (Lines 19-21). Though providing text for Sam was certainly not Xiomara's stated intention, he may have taken the "we-ness" of her language as an indication they would co-construct written responses to the BTSA tasks.

Xiomara described her coaching approach with Sam as follows: (5.13)

Excerpt 5.13 May 10, 2017, Xiomara on coaching Sam: Initially and eventually

1 X I have to have a more directive approach with him and initially that's
2 fine I think in that in a coaching relationship I think that's fine. But
3 eventually you want to kind of like switch that over and have them do
4 like more of the heavy lifting like just like the students.

Xiomara moved back and forth between what she described as a "directive" style, telling Sam that BTSA tasks were *his* work to do (see Excerpt 5.15), to giving him the resources, along with BTSA-passing language, to support the goal of increasing student reading levels. "Gradual release of responsibility," a pedagogy she was trying to coach Sam into using to support behavior management, also laid the foundation for Xiomara's coaching style with him (Lines 3-4, 5.13). A close analysis of Sam's reflections of his experience of professional development reveals that *how* he ended up experiencing professional growth was perhaps less about Xiomara's coaching style than about how Sam viewed the BTSA tasks. His "practice pushing" needs centered around self-identified classroom behavior management. For Sam, these needs interrupted engagement in the inquiry work BTSA required. In other words, in addition to being outside Sam's most pressing daily concerns, the BTSA expectations as he appeared to understand them were outside Sam's ZPD. The end result for Sam was a focus on task completion for his credential – not a focus on learning (even about student behavior) from it. Perhaps due to, in part, his disconnect between behavior management and the close instruction and monitoring that were required during a small-group intervention; perhaps due in part to Sam's struggles to collect assessment data (which were never entered into the spreadsheet labeled as the 'data tracker'), Sam appeared reluctant to draft BTSA responses without Xiomara's direct input. (5.14 and 5.15)

Excerpt 5.14 April 27, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sam): You're going to get it done

1	X	You have until we meet again on the 5th. I want to see all this done
2		@@@ but you also have to have a good start of that draft because on the
3		12th, it needs to be submitted. You know what I mean?
4	Sam	Yeah, if possible, could we meet that Thursday and do it?
5	X	May 11th.? May 11th is when I want to meet with you and I will be here
6		to re**view** it with you, but it needs to be 100% done on the 11th. That's
7		why on the 5th (.) I want to check. That way on the 11th we're not here
8		forever. On the 5th if you have the bulk of it **done** on the 11th, if we only
9		have to focus on teacher claim and student claim. We'll be in much
10		better shape. But yeah for **sure** we can meet on the 5th.
11	Sam	Wait yeah. So to go over it we're meeting on Thursday?
12	X	So next meeting is on Friday the 5th where I will see first draft. The
13		following meeting is on May 11th.
14	Sam	… [2 minutes later] We'll get it done.
15	X	**You're** going to get it done. I know it. @@@

From lines 4 and 14, 5.14, "Could we meet... and do it" and "We'll get it done" and from his reflection (5.15, below), it appears Sam did not see himself moving through the tasks on his own without Xiomara's step-by-step confirmation of his project.

Excerpt 5.15 April 27, 2017, Sam BTSA reflection, "Glad we finally have a plan"

1	Sam	Well as far as the credentialing goes. These are all things I **have** to get @
2		done to get my credential. So. I'm glad we're getting it done. Because it
3		was kind of (.) just sitting there for a while. We didn't have the chance to
4		meet for a couple weeks so. Glad we finally have a plan (.) and we're
5		getting **rolling** on it.

Even after Xiomara had corrected him in Line 15 (5.14) "**You're** going to get it done," Sam continued to reflect on their work together (5.15). While Sam stated that the BTSA tasks were "things I have to get done," he then moved from "I" to four uses of "we," speaking as if the BTSA tasks really were a collaborative project that he and Xiomara were actively doing together. Xiomara, however, expected Sam to be more independent (5.14). Sam's struggles to meaningfully engage in the tasks required of him appeared to be twofold. First, he understood the guidelines that student behavior – which is what he

had identified as an area where he was challenged and needed to grow – could not be the subject of his inquiry. Second, perhaps because the ultimate focus of his inquiry appeared outside his ZPD, Sam perceived that the drafting of the BTSA responses was an activity he and Xiomara would do together.

Sam, Xiomara, and Sage considered the BTSA project a teaching performance assessment, and the intersection of all their experiences with performance assessments, teacher evaluations, and teacher education culminated in tasks that Sam didn't appear ready, on his own, to accomplish. In addition, though the questions each participant responded to after every PD session included reflecting on how the session connected to their credential process, Sam did not make connections between PDs and his credentialing process (BTSA) while Sage consistently and succinctly connected the two. This consistently inconsistent reflexivity speaks to the importance of the District, BTSA coaches, and schools to position BTSA tasks as work that deepens professional practice and not simply clears a credential. Finding #2, that successful professional development happens when teachers value the matter at hand and can simultaneously understand and apply their understandings in meaningful ways, was visible as professional growth most consistently for Sage. For Melisa and Sam, however, analysis of their experiences of professional development revealed fewer moments of meaningful, successful engagement.

Finding #3: "This Hoop is Just Too Much", Us vs. Them

This section focuses on the third finding connected to professional development for early career bilingual teachers – that of the positioning of "us" vs. "them" during the BTSA program. The BTSA entities wielding power – whether at state or district level –

were viewed as groups requiring compliance via what participants viewed as a credential exam. As such, a dichotomous relationship was perceived between those who were viewed as controlling BTSA and those who were required to comply with BTSA in order to pass the program. Xiomara represented OUSD as a BTSA coach and, due to a budget freeze resulting in the inability to pay outside scorers, ultimately scored her coachees' final BTSA projects. However, Xiomara most frequently aligned herself with her coachees, using second person pronouns "us" and "we" in contrast to "them," the people or institution behind BTSA requirements. At various times and to varying degrees, Sage, Xiomara, and Sam all viewed completing the final BTSA project as a little more than a hoop through which to be jumped to clear their credentials. Once the BTSA project became a hoop, it became incompatible with opportunities to "push practice." Excerpts in this section show examples of comments all three participants made regarding elements of hoop-jumping. Whether at times Xiomara's dramatic language and voiced outrage at the "too much" requirements of the project could be interpreted as a performance on her part to motivate her coachees and/or align with their (presumed) sense of being overwhelmed, analysis also shows that, while Sage at times picked up and repeated Xiomara's language "in the moment," once the meetings ended, her reflections of each coaching session returned to thinking about how to improve her teaching, and were consistently very positive. One example follows, via Excerpt 5.16. Here, Sage repeated Xiomara's statement that the inquiry cycle was "a lot of work" – but Sage did not repeat Xiomara's assertion that the cycle was "so massive" (Line 3), "too overwhelming" (Line 5), or "outrageous" (Line 7).

Excerpt 5.16 April 11, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sage): "It's a lot of work"

1	X	(to K): So right now she's [Sage is] basically doing the instruction for her
2		inquiry cycle? But. But this is **so massive** like what they're expected to
3		do? That Sage and I said that over spring break she was going to start
4		inputting things as we go along instead of waiting till the end (.) Because
5		it just becomes **way too** overwhelming.
6	Sg	=Yeah.
7	X	It's outrageous it's a lot of work.
8	Sg	[Yeah it's a lot of work.

Tension around completing the assignments built as the due date approached, yet from the first coaching session with Sage I observed on April 11, Xiomara referenced the project itself as being "so massive," "way too overwhelming," and "outrageous," or "ludicrous" (Lines 2, 5, and 7, Excerpt 5.16, Line 4, Excerpt 5.17). Sage, however, while agreeing in the moment that it was indeed a lot of work, and closer to the deadline "a waste of my time" (Line 5, Except 5.17), consistently referenced the benefits she and her students were gaining during every post-coaching oral reflection (see, for example, 5.8.). The conversation in 5.17, below, occurred on the day Xiomara and Sage were reading through Sage's completed rough draft of the BTSA project. Sage's work was essentially complete, and they had time to reflect on the inquiry cycle and the required tasks within.

Excerpt 5.17 May 9, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sage): "This hoop is just too much"

1	X	Like seriously, when me and Sam did his we just copied those exemplars
2		and put in there your information. Like **everyone** did. Everyone's we
3		read. Everyone's are going to be copied from here. with your
4		information. @@@ Yeah. It's ludicrous. So **I** would do **that**.
5	Sg	OK. This is such a waste of my time.
6	X	[I know. I know. So I talked to Sam
7		about just like the inquiry cycle in general? I don't know how you feel ->
8		it's a good **idea** but this whole thing? This **hoop** (.) is just too much.
9		Like I think the actual practice of it is good. I don't know. How do you
10		feel.
11	Sg	Yeah (.) I feel like it's a lot to (...) I mean when they're expecting (.) you
12		know (.) if they want some authentic reflection. Then that's one thing (.)

13 and some like authentic processing and reflectiveness and looking at
14 where you're at and where you're going (.) how this worked out. That's
15 one thing. But if they're expecting you to basically just follow [mhmm] a
16 certain (.) they're basically looking at how well you can follow a certain
17 like… instruction? that isn't taught to us (.) isn't really **needed** [mhmm]
18 in teaching. Like I don't **need** this structure [mhmm].

Xiomara was outspoken about what she saw as the "too much"-ness of the required tasks. Sage had already developed into a reflective practitioner; the "hoop" didn't appear to impede her progress, her coaching conversations, nor her choice of subject/language of instruction to examine. Nearer the deadline, however, once she had finished reflecting on her instruction, she began to reflect on the tasks themselves, stating, "They're basically looking at how well you can follow a certain structure that isn't taught to us, isn't really needed in teaching" (Lines 16-18), positioning herself as "us" apart from "them." Sage reported that she didn't "need this structure" (Line 18), contrasting the tasks from "authentic reflection" (Lines 12 and 2). While Sage spoke often of the value of the project, she also spoke of a difference between "coaching" and the project itself, stating on April 17 that "I feel like I didn't pass my last inquiry cycle because we spent more time on coaching and less time on this. Yeah. To be honest." While often Sage took up only the less dramatic phrasing of her coach, at the very end of her submission process (May 9 and 16) she expressed her own emotions with the same intensity, as in Line 5, Excerpt 5.17, "This is such a waste of my time" and below, throughout Excerpt 5.18. When her emotions became more stressed, Sage clearly expressed the "us vs. them" sentiment (Lines 11, 15, 18 in Excerpt 5.17 – "they're expecting…they're basically looking at…structure that isn't taught to us"). The most vocal expression of this positioning took place on May 16, four days after her project was submitted, when Sage

and Xiomara met to score it. The scoring began with a technical glitch. Xiomara blamed the glitch on an individual at "the District," who had yet to give her access to Sage's materials, even though six weeks had passed since she became Sage's coach. For three minutes after Xiomara stated, "We're not linked," Sage tried different ways to share her project on the software platform, to no avail. Likely influenced by the fact that she had not passed, on first try, her previous BTSA project, this scoring complication was enough to push Sage close to tears. Xiomara and I hopped into crisis management mode and talked Sage through a way Xiomara would be able essentially to complete the scoring right then and there. However, while Sage was being scored, in contrast to her usual confident and engaged body language, she was tense, sitting bent over at the waist, leaning in to the computer, arms crossed, rocking herself left to right, reading along as Xiomara read out loud the entire project. As Xiomara read out loud, Sage lifted her eyebrows and pursed her lips, very focused on the text being read.

Excerpt 5.18 May 16, 2017, BTSA Scoring Session (Sage): "This is so ridiculous"

1	X	So. Watch. I can go into **this** and then I should be able to click right here.
2		"View summary". Right? But I can't see anything. This is what it shows.
3	Sg	I don't know::. I just love how they sent us **anything** about how to do
4		any of this. It's super. Helpful.
5	K	(...) Can you:: score from the Google doc?
6	X	Yeah, yeah. That's what we're about to do. Because this is. Ah **silly.** It's
7		just silly. Okay.
8	Sg	Then I'm going to just copy and paste this and put my updated thing into
9		the Google doc.
10	X	I can also read it off yours.
11	Sg	It's okay-> I'm just going to copy and paste it right now and put it in
12		there.
13	X	=OK
14	K	(... 20 seconds) What does SOL stand for?
15	Sg	Synthesis of learning or shit out of luck.
16	K	That's what I was thinking shit out of luck.
17	Sg	I just. Aaahh. I don't know. I copied it? and then (...) pasted it. But I
18		don't see anything. This is (so ridiculous). (So ridiculous.)

19	X	Let me just read it off yours.
20	Sg	I'm really going to fucking cry right now.
21	X	[No just let me read it off yours.
22	Sg	[I'm ready to be done.
23	X	=It's fine.
24	Sg	=I don't think I can do this right now, like seriously. This is ridiculous.
29	K	You have the rubric here?
30	X	No I have it here
31	K	=Okay, perfect. You both share the two screens.
32	X	We're going to be super @@ techy right now. Okay. So, what I'm going
33		to do. Is I'm going to read this out loud. So. It doesn't matter that I don't
34		have it in front of me because I was going to read it out loud anyway.
35		And **then** I'm going to (...) put it on the **rubric**. (...) Can I write on it?
36		(...) Okay.

Xiomara allied herself with Sage and against the District entity who was to blame for limiting Xiomara's ability to do her job and adding to Sage's stress level. Sage continued Xiomara's references to "them" at the District, stating sarcastically "I just love how they send us anything about how to do any of this" in Lines 3-4. This exasperation and sarcasm, and her swearing on the verge of tears in Lines 20 and 22, all show fragile she was, despite her hard work, her preparation, and how well-regarded she was by her coach (and by me). Sage was without question a thorough, thoughtful, capable early-career teacher, and the suggestion that a glitch might stall her BTSA score – even temporarily – was enough to send her into a tailspin. This sense of overwhelm resting just under the surface is an experience of professional development that neither the school, the District, nor the State would logically intend as an outcome of professional growth, yet both Sage and Sam appeared overwhelmed, sometimes to the point of immobility, by their BTSA project. Though both passed their final assignments and were recommended for clear credentials, Sage managed to plan and perform a meaningful instructional sequence despite being overwhelmed. Sam's growth was not as evident in his inquiry

project, and questions linger about how this performance assessment may have interrupted growth he may have been more motivated or supported to make if not held to deadlines and guidelines set by the District and the State.

Like with Sage, Xiomara aligned herself during Sam's sessions as Sam's ally and advocate. For example, on April 27, she said the following:

Excerpt 5.19 April 27, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sam): "They've lost their minds"

1	X	Okay so. Tha::t needs to get do::ne. Cause not **only** (.) is the cycle of
2		inquiry due on the 12th? Like **everything** is due. They've **lost** their
3		minds. I think I'm going to email them. And be like "That's not
4		necessary to have **every**thing due. For what purpose."

While in the moment this comment could be received as sympathetic, it is possible that Sam's hesitations to write lay in part to his own resistance to "them" – the District or the State that had imposed deadlines that were not conducive to his growth needs. Considering Fairclough's division of context into social conditions of production and social conditions of interpretation, Xiomara's suggestion that "they" had "lost their minds" (Line 2, 5.18) may have been interpreted by Sam to mean that his coach thought BTSA project was not an appropriate use of his time or energy. While this sentiment may have been supported in part by his coach, it may also have limited Sam's motivation to complete the required tasks. While Xiomara used language describing the inquiry project as outrageous and ridiculous, establishing a position that the task of writing up planning and instruction was little more than a hoop, the context from which Xiomara was producing this language was a context of deep commitment to strengthening pedagogy and to helping both teachers pass BTSA. Throughout their coaching sessions, how Sam and Sage responded to their BTSA responsibilities connected to their own interpretations

of Xiomara's one-on-one interactions with them. How they responded connected as well to their own relationships to the State and the District. As discussed in the previous section, Sam performed as if he expected Xiomara to do at least some of his work for him; her mixing of pronouns may unconsciously have reinforced this confusion. He struggled according to the BTSA timeline to represent any planning, instruction, or resulting student performance.

In terms of a natural comparison of Sam to Sage, the "us" vs. "them" categorization might also fit into positioning of Sage and Sam as developing professionals. Sage was positioned as an insider "like" Xiomara and Sam was not. Sage came to coaching sessions ready to share the writing she had already completed while Sam was more productive when he and Xiomara co-constructed text during their sessions – both typing at the same time on a shared document. While co-construction is an example of how Xiomara displayed an "us" alignment with Sam, once on his own, Sam was less successful in completing the required tasks, reinforcing a "them" position. Rather than dichotomizing Sam's and Sage's behavior, a pattern I fell into during the first rounds of data analysis, what might have changed if I and his coach had questioned his moments of inaction not as resistance to self-growth, but as incompatibility with an institution that was not supporting him the way he needed? Sam may not have been able to articulate this complexity at an early point in his career – but given the short timeframe all three had to complete all BTSA requirements, the time to step back and try to examine a struggling teacher felt too crunched. Regardless, Sam's completion of tasks in order to meet credential requirements did not meet the intended growth outcomes that the State and the District articulate in their induction policy documents.

Finally, the positioning of "us" vs. "them" may have impacted Xiomara's own coaching practice. She, too, was "on stage" as a first-year BTSA coach, and on two occasions (Excerpts 5.20 and 5.21) she expressed concern that her own coaching practice could be drawn into question based on her coachees' portfolios. The first mention of this concern took place during Sam's coaching session four days before his project was due (5.20); the second took place after he had turned everything in, during the meeting when Xiomara scored his portfolio (5.21).

Excerpt 5.20 May 8, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sam): "It still has to be scored"

1	K	Okay, so you'll do like a practice scoring.
2	X	Right, so that way, we know what he needs to work on-> when we meet
3		again on Thursday. Cause then on the next week, so it's due Friday. He
4		turns it in and then the next week (.) we have to score it (.) like together?
5		And I have to say whether or not he passed. This is not how they did it
6		last time but because of the budget freeze? they don't have money to pay
7		all the coaches to **score**. The things. Right? @@ So.
8	K	But it still has to be scored.
9	X	Right. It still has to be scored and I can't just like (.) we can't just lie and
10		pass him because they're going to do random (.) scoring of people's? So
11		(.) let's say they picked his and I was like 15 and they have him as a 12.
12		I'm, we're, **I'm** probably going to get in trouble. And he'll probably fail.
13		@@ Right? So.

When stating that she and Sam had to score his portfolio together and she had "to say whether or not he passed" (Line 5, 5.20), Xiomara was both telling me (but perhaps Sam was the intended audience) about a procedure I already understood, given her sessions with Sage, as well as signaling to Sam that she was not happy with the situation. By "having to" score Sam's portfolio, she was placed by "them" – the District – in an uncomfortable (and less-than-ideally-ethical) position of disentangling an evaluation of her own coaching from her coachee's performance. Xiomara did not bring up concerns about scoring audits during her meetings with Sage, whose portfolio was without a doubt

thoroughly and thoughtfully prepared. In Excerpt 5.21, below, after she had finished scoring Sam, Xiomara stated twice within four lines, "I feel I did a great job scoring this" – as well as stating out loud, "I'm a really legit scorer, I think" (Lines 1-4). These signals of discomfort arguably served to deepen Xiomara's sentiments of "us" vs. the District, in that, without her consent, she had been placed in a scoring role that was not what she had agreed to when agreeing to be a BTSA coach.

Excerpt 5.21 May 15, 2017, BTSA Scoring Session (Sam): "I'm a really legit scorer"

1	X	Hopefully we don't get audited @@ although **I** feel I did a great job
2		scoring this.
3	Sam	Yeah I don't think I didn't pass.
4	X	No, I'm a really **legit** scorer I think. I feel like I did a great job @@
5		scoring it. I hope.
6	Sam	I don't think you're trying to pull the wool over anyone's eyes.

Returning to Research Question 2a, while Xiomara as a BTSA coach represented the District, she appeared to distance herself from "them," preferring instead to build school-based, one-on-one relationships with Sam and Sage where she was on the same side as the two of them – in contrast to the District. This interpretation of professional growth via the BTSA tasks may inadvertently have established a dichotomous relationship between "us" and "them" that Sam was less experienced to navigate. Sage, a seasoned activist in addition to being further along a continuum of coaching and progress at Olmeda, appeared more successful at simultaneously meeting the professional demands of the BTSA tasks and distinguishing useful portions from less-than-useful portions. While this sort of positioning is ubiquitous in schools, districts, and current U.S. society, careful consideration of social conditions of discourse production *and* interpretation shows how, especially for a novice teacher, divisive language may have interrupted professional growth.

Finding #4: English Learning as the Default

Considering how language ideologies intersect with California's preliminary-to-clear credentialing process, this section addresses the fourth finding that emerged from BTSA sessions – that English Learner status (not, for example, Emergent Bilingual status), even among strong advocates for language-, race-, and class-based social justice, was entrenched in how study participants referred to their students during "high stakes" work – i.e., the BTSA performance cycles. This prominent language ideology circulating around the bilingual authorization – that of English learning as the default – was reproduced via BTSA by Xiomara and Sage. Sam, Sage, and Xiomara all referred, on multiple occasions, to the similarity of the BTSA project to the PACT (Performance Assessment for California Teachers), a pre-service requirement that all three had completed. The PACT is aligned with California's Standards of Teaching Practice, and though a bilingual PACT handbook does exist, Sage, Sam, and Xiomara reported completing monolingual (English) performance assessments. Their monolingual PACT required that at least one of three focal students whose work was examined during the Instruction commentary be an English Learner, and that candidates' Context of Learning include both a calculation of how many students were labeled as English Learners, "Redesignated English Learners," and "Proficient English Speakers," as well as an overview of classroom totals of California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores, by language domain and proficiency level (PACT, 2009). As stated in Chapter 3, California is the state with the largest number of students labeled as English Learners (22.4% in 2017), so it is important that all teachers learn how to teach students with a range of English proficiency. However, this English Learner status, which is also

evident in CL-628B, appeared to carry over into Olmeda's BTSA context. BTSA also aligns with California's Standards of Teaching Practice, and as such, discourses of the state were logically reproduced via OUSD's BTSA materials. These discourses, while not denying space for languages other than English, also did not demand languages other than English, even for bilingually authorized teachers. The BTSA written commentary required representation of "subgroups and/or lower achieving students" (OUSD, 2016a, p. 38), which both Sam and Sage chose to label as English Learners. Sage's BTSA project examined her math class, where instruction was in Spanish, yet neither Sage nor Xiomara questioned this representation of "lower achieving students" even though English proficiency arguably was not central to these second-grade students' math understandings. Math in Kindergarten and first grade had also been taught in Spanish.

Excerpt 5.22, below, provides an example of how Xiomara viewed the BTSA inquiry task as "very much" like the PACT (Line 4) and, connected to this already-completed task, counterproductive to her ability to coach the teachers in a way she thought more useful.

Excerpt 5.22 April 11, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sage): "Like our PACT"

1	X	and I'm like (.) yeah there just isn't very much time (...) Yeah and I think
2		it's good. I think the inquiry cycle is good. But I think (.) that this
3		**expectation** of doing (.) all of this? Is really. Too much. I mean (.) and to
4		have to write it in this way:: (.) like (.) it's very much the way our PACT
5		was (.) for teacher school.
6	Sg	=Yeah it's **exactly** like it. The PACT.
7	X	[Yeah.
8	X	Like we have to actually (.) um (.) **cite research**. Which I'm like that's
9		**good** and all but like (.) wouldn't it be so much better if I could like
10		come. And you guys had done stuff (.) So I could like come and observe
11		and coach my **person** and they can observe and they can
12	K	=Right. Right. Because you already passed a PACT. So why are you
13	X	[Yeah. Yeah.Why
14		are you doing another one. They're doing two more. @@@ Yeah. I don't

like it. I'm not (...) I'm not (...) I just don't think it's (.) it's not helping **me** help **my** person.

Xiomara saw a clear distinction between the BTSA and coaching. As BTSA was set up as a performance assessment-cum-inquiry project, there was no mention of coaching in the questions nor in the model project participants were shown. A second and third performance assessment was not, according to Xiomara, "helping me help my person" (Lines 15-16, 5.22). The redundancy of this "teacher school" (Line 5) assessment became visible when Xiomara offered a suggestion to Sage on how to talk about "various subgroups" in her classroom. (5.23)

Excerpt 5.23 May 9, 2017, BTSA Coaching Session (Sage): Subgroup achievement

Sg So, to what extent did the data help you **understand** how to support achievement for various subgroups? I didn't really know what to say I was like (.) It impacted the understanding of these students and helped them grow (...) And then (.) Do I maybe talk about (.) how these are my lowest students?

X =Yeah. So. (...) So I think (.) you also want to explain who your class is again here? So. "In my classroom, I have this many you know (.) English Language Learners. I have this many students who are proficient in Math and then this many (.) approaching and this many (.) below?" I would break it down like **that**. And (.) "Because I have all English Language Learners, I chose to focus on the subgroup of my students who were performing the lowest" Right? And just going into who they are and the::n (...)

Already established by the State, "English Learners" are an undisputed subgroup that every California teacher should consider. Xiomara's comments are included as an example of the extent to which this subgroup – no matter their language of instruction – became the default subgroup in a bilingual school. Sage did not question Xiomara's suggestion, in her final draft responding to how context and classroom culture impacted the inquiry cycle (5.24):

Excerpt 5.24 May16, 2017, BTSA Scoring Session (Sage): ELL subgroup

1	X	"The five focal students are three boys and two girls. All five of these
2		students are English Language Learners (.) although I teach math in
3		Spanish. One student's home language is Mam (.) an indigenous
4		language from Guatemala. Three of the students are newcomers who
5		have arrived in the last year from Guatemala and Mexico."

Though Sage both reported that she taught math in Spanish and qualified her EL label, extending the context to report that three of the five students were newcomers, English proficiency remained a descriptor of the culture and context of her classroom. This descriptor, even for a teacher who, outside BTSA, actively interrupted the EL-emphasis promoted by the State (See Excerpt 4.1), demonstrates how overarching is the influence of English. This default to English extended to Sage's and Xiomara's understanding of the language Sage needed to use (English only) for her BTSA project. Xiomara saw no space within BTSA for attention to Spanish speakers, other than a move "towards the ELD aspect" (Lines 13-14, 5.25). She also referenced the "extra work" (Line 8) that bilingual teachers needed to do in order to either translate their instruction and planning into English or risk being asked to rewrite their commentaries (5.25, Lines 31-33). This extra work went unrecognized (Line 7).

Excerpt 5.25 May 10, 2017, Xiomara on Coaching: Bilingual teachers

1	K	So do you:: see in your coaching:: (.) in the language of BTSA. Is there
2		any **explicit** (.) language about coaching for bilingual teachers or can
3		you actually do (.) like put in all the [BTSA platform] stuff in a language
4		other than English? I guess in Oakland it would be Spanish (.) Are there
5		any spaces that you:: have been able to (.) think about what it needs to
6		clear a **bilingual** authorization?
7	X	=No. So (.) no not for BTSA there's no **space** or like recognition for that
8		**difference** and for (.) you know the extra work that these teachers **are**
9		doing. In the last meeting I just had with Sage I told her I scripted in
10		Spanish and I was wondering what that was going to look like when she
11		uploaded it? (.) So I'm curious if she's going to translate it all? Or if she's
12		going to upload it **as is.** I'm not sure but there is. Yeah. There's **no** space
13		at all like (.) the **only** thing that they're **doing** is more towards the ELD

aspect and like looking at underserved populations so like what (.) what **subgroups** they do want you to look at subgroups (.) when you're (.) doing your cycle of inquiry and when you're just thinking about your context of your classroom and at our school right-> it's kind of hard to do? So (.) I think that's really the **only thing** that that BTSA does. Yeah.

K =OK. What do you think would happen if she uploaded it in Spanish? Like would **anything** happen?

X No=

K =Like if anyone else were reading, like if you guys didn't have to read your own @ portfolios this time?

X I think tha::t (.) because you have to do the reasoning? She would probably end up (.) like (.) explaining what happened in that anyway? So I think that the people would just be like oka::y? (.) And yeah. I don't think she would get scored **down** for it though unless (.) If she did the **whole thing** in Spanish on the other hand like I think that would probably be a big issue. @@@

K Why

X Because they wouldn't be able to read it. Yeah, and I don't think. **I think** instead of (.) getting a translator? They would probably make her redo it.

Xiomara's understanding of language limitations of BTSA may be connected to the fact that there was no bilingual-specific education that year, and there were no materials or sample portfolios that were available in a language other than English. The "us" vs. "them" positioning that Xiomara referenced continued in that she thought "they would probably make [Sage] redo" a portfolio instead of find a translator (Lines 31-33, 5.25, above). Further, by stating an assumption that Sage would need to redo work to turn it into English, Xiomara displayed her contextual understanding of English as the default language of assessment in credentialing. This assumption, for a seasoned bilingual teacher, connected to Xiomara's own history of performance and assessment, and is discussed further in Chapter 6.

During her interview, OUSD's BTSA coordinator, Alice, spoke at length of the ups and downs the BTSA program had experienced over the nearly 20 years she had been

involved. Many of the "downs" were connected to budget struggles and staff layoffs, and while during the 2016-17 year, Alice had returned to the district and was trying to re-establish the program, she was aware of uneven BTSA experiences. When asked about possibilities to complete a BTSA portfolio in a language other than English, she said it was indeed possible. She spoke of hopes that scoring bilingual portfolios would become more systematic. 5.26, below, highlights language that points to the continued default to English even in bilingual programs – any other language would be considered an "accommodation" the District would make "of course" (Line 6). However, an accommodation is not the same as an expectation. As there is no mention in CL-628B of a distinction between an authorization added to a clear or preliminary credential, education or teacher performance in a language other than English – especially to clear a bilingually authorized credential – is absent. While absence does not equal prohibition, the likelihood that even long-term employees like Xiomara and Madeleine (Xiomara's BTSA coach) received consistent opportunities to practice coaching in Spanish or even practice BTSA portfolio drafting in Spanish, appeared nonexistent.

Excerpt 5.26 August 7, 2018, Alice on BTSA: Portfolios in languages other than English

1	K	Would it have been possible for teachers to write them [BTSA
2		portfolios] in languages other than English?
3	A	Yes. And we had some people who did.
4	K	Oh OK->
5	A	**Some** people contacted us and said can I write this in a (...) and we said
6		yes will make that **of course** (.) accommodation.

Olmeda participants interpreted BTSA policy according to their prior experiences with "teacher school" and BTSA. Since there was no exemplar in a language other than English, their opportunity to envision the possibility of using Spanish could only grow

out of positions of vulnerability – to passing or being audited. Xiomara was concerned about her reputation and status as a coach. Sam and Sage needed to pass to clear their credentials. Even if access to "accommodations" was not restricted, it was not publicized, and therefore appeared impossible.

Conclusion

This chapter responds to my second research question: How do these ideologies and planning orientations intersect with professional development for early career teachers in one local schooling context, and what are the ramifications of these intersections?

a. How does a school district that hosts bilingual schools interpret professional growth for multiple subject (i.e. elementary teacher) bilingual authorization holders who teach in bilingual schools?
b. How does an individual bilingual elementary school interpret professional growth for bilingual teachers?
c. How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?

"Unequal encounters" (Fairclough, 2001) are visible in the four findings described in Chapter 5. Distributed leadership during PD planning and orchestration, along with oppositional positioning during the BTSA process, led to uneven, unintended results. A mismatch between Wayne's and Olmeda's language ideologies resulted in the limitation of meaningful opportunities for Melisa to grow during PD. Her primary language of instruction was absent from PD materials and PD conversations. In this way,

opportunities for her to work in her ZPD were also limited. English remained the default reference point in bilingual professional development, both during PD and even in descriptors of students in Sage's BTSA project.

Through PDs and BTSA linked to state standards, teachers are being conditioned to become actors of the State. Though Alice reported that OUSD "accommodates" BTSA work in Spanish, the BTSA participants at Olmeda remained unaware of this option. If both the early-career teachers and their support teams act in terms of what they think the District or State wants, and the State is not articulating "bilingual" in any way other than English Learner, then if teachers develop their own identities of enactors of bilingual policy for students other than those labeled as English Learners, they are acting outside the policy. Further, the absence of any professional development Spanish – in addition to absence of Spanish Language Development standards, limits bilingual teachers' in-service development of their own senses of self as members of District or State in languages other than English. To develop further, teachers must seek this professional growth on their own. In this way, the burden rests more heavily on people who may have already been marginalized to do "more" to work against the unfairness that Melisa referred to. These imbalances outline critical issues of ideology and practice in bilingual education. While California has legislated efforts to improve the educational experiences and outcomes of emergent bilingual students, the non-English portion of bilingualism, including teacher education in languages other than English, remains far behind English. What these issues suggest, in terms of intersections between language ideologies/planning orientations and early career teachers' professional development/credentialing processes is continued separation of languages. These

intersections and separations are further discussed in Chapter 6. The continued division of languages and language speakers both keeps the dynamic nature of multilingual communication and communities invisible and continues to position English (and English teachers and speakers) as the most valuable in bilingual schools.

Chapter 6

Discussion of Findings: Intersections of Language Ideologies in Dimensions of Time, Space, and Power

In this chapter, I follow Fairclough's suggestion that any given excerpt of discourse can "simultaneously be a part of a situational struggle, an institutional struggle, and a societal struggle" (2001, pp. 58-59). These struggles link individuals, institutions, and societies, and the struggles visible in this study connected early-career bilingual teachers and their coaches to the hegemonic role English plays in California's bilingual education policyscape. In my attempt to understand, as previously noted, "why [things] happen the way they do" (Heller, 1999), it is essential to look at the multiple ways participants' actions connect both to belief systems and to the structures that shape trajectories of professional growth. To do so, I organize this chapter into two sections. In the first section, language policy appropriation, I discuss findings of my study using a multidimensional heuristic. In the second section, critical consciousness in bilingual education, I connect study findings to the bilingual teacher education and critical language scholarship literature reviewed in Chapter 2. As such, I contribute to the literature on "*how* language matters to people" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 14).

Restatement of Research Questions

The following questions guided this ethnographic language policy study:

1. How are the language ideologies and language planning orientations that circulate around California's elementary teaching credential authorizing bilingual instruction produced and interpreted at multiple dimensions of policy development and implementation?

2. How do these ideologies and planning orientations intersect with professional development for early career teachers in one local schooling context, and what are the ramifications of these intersections?
    a. How does a school district that hosts bilingual schools interpret professional growth for multiple subject (i.e. elementary teacher) bilingual authorization holders who teach in bilingual schools?
    b. How does an individual bilingual elementary school interpret professional growth for bilingual teachers?
    c. How do individual, early-career multiple subject (elementary) bilingual authorization-credentialed teachers experience professional development that is targeted toward their professional growth?

Chapter 4 focused on the first question, uncovering the language planning orientation that every California bilingual teacher, through authorization to teach in a bilingual setting, is exposed to – a language-as-problematic resource orientation. Delavan et al.'s (2016) metaphor of main character and minor character aptly applies to English and "other" languages in the bilingual authorization. While this orientation was contested at the district and school levels in Oakland and Olmeda, it was not contested to the same degree by all. Further, the ways that individuals expressed their disagreement or discomfort with the policy revealed the power of the text to reproduce situational, institutional, and societal struggles.

Chapter 5 focused on the second question, looking at the intersection of a language-as-problematic resource orientation with local professional development. Visible were instances of "how language matters" that, at times, matched the position of

the State, even while most study participants, when shown CL-628B, questioned the language and orientation of the State. What follows is a discussion of how dimensions of power, along with time and space, may account for these findings.

Language Policy Appropriation Across and Through Time, Space, and Power

Building on critical policy research that has examined connections between broad and local language policies in action (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014; Johnson, 2010; Johnson & Johnson, 2015; Mortimer, 2016; Valdiviezo, 2013), this study explored local understandings as they intersect at multiple dimensions with California's bilingual teaching authorization. This section explores how people at Olmeda Elementary and Oakland Unified School District's central offices, connected to bilingual education to different degrees, produced and interpreted ideologies of bilingualism and bilingual education. These ideologies underlie how teacher educators and coaches, operating from positions of power, interpreted and (re)produced language-in-education policies during training and coaching sessions. They also underlie how early-career teachers, operating from their own degrees of (dis)empowerment, interpreted and (re)produced the messages they received. The three teachers, all still vulnerable to credential stipulations and hiring decisions, expressed their disagreement or discomfort with the policy. These situational, institutional, and societal struggles were taken up in three distinct ways, via positions developed over years of personal experiences in institutions and society. Sage was the most vocal in her resistance to the language-as-problematic resource orientation, while Sam opted to append the policy to force it to match his position. Melisa, however, responded with confusion and concern that she was not following the policy. In questioning her job performance (not, as Sam and Sage did, questioning the State's

misrepresentation of their visions), Melisa assigned the State the authority to stipulate who and what she was teaching, and in what language. In doing so, she also reduced her first language to "foreign" status. Returning to what policy does and who can do it (Levinson et al., 2009), these three responses, when connected to the three teachers' race, language, and education experiences *and* their untenured employment, highlight the importance of ethnographic methods of examining a language policy.

For Olmeda teachers and teacher supporters, the dimension of time, space, and power closest to these participants' experiences "on the ground" was the orientation to language promoted by the bilingual authorization. For different participants, this orientation existed in different dimensions. For Xiomara and Melisa, who had been elementary students impacted by orientations and legislation against Spanish-as-resource, the bilingual authorization's orientation connected to time, space, and power that encompassed most of their schooling experiences. As Xiomara mentioned when discussing her background, the limitation of her chance to grow up bilingually also shifted her relationship with her grandmother – something she sought to remedy. For Sam and Sage, the orientation connected to time, space, and power in terms of their professional choices, at minimum – and likely shaped their own histories of Spanish acquisition and cultural competence. Wayne, Sam, and Sage were willing to work through their questions from a position of relative comfort, perhaps because of their personal and political convictions, perhaps because the answers to these questions held no immediate consequences for them. Only Melisa responded with concern that she might be doing something wrong. This "bit of reality," in terms of the expressive value of discourse, deserves attention.

In Chapters 4 and 5, I examined the ideologies of bilingual education circulating at the state, district, and school levels, and found that voices within the same "level" (e.g., CCTC or OUSD or Olmeda) did not unify around one ideology or language planning orientation. While this finding is, to some degree, not uncommon, this lack of alignment, for study participants, was often consequential. This finding builds on both Mortimer (2016) and Valdiviezo's (2013) work, deepening ways of looking at how individual actions are consequential, and dialog between local and further removed policy actors is essential. While a causal relationship does not necessarily exist between the bilingual authorization-as-policy and the supports teachers in a bilingual setting received, these two entities are connected. As mentioned in Chapter 3, this study further demonstrates that language policies are not "decontextualized objects"; rather, they "are part and parcel of the discursive social contexts of the societies for which they are crafted" (Hult, 2010, p. 9).

Further, legislative language crafted for California society, in other words "the law," has shifted according to legislative decisions at various points in history up to the present. However, there are only traces of shifting language around the bilingual authorization. As evident in Chapter 4, when copied and pasted from the California Code of Regulations (CCR), somewhat messily, likely by multiple authors, over many years, into CL-628B, "the law" was moved, by text producers, into a new space. Language of CCR thereby became language of CCTC, the authority that grants permission to teach. Since both the CCTC and CCR operate at the state level, study participants – text interpreters – recognized the bilingual authorization as a power-wielding policy. For all participants, conditioned perhaps to the rule of law, what the authorization "did", at the

least, was present the language planning orientation of the State as established and as a rule to be followed. The language-as-problematic resource orientation, which signals a willingness to value languages other than English as important resources, still prioritizes them as resources to learn English.

An additional societal context that must be considered is the add-on nature of the bilingual authorization, which limits the power of the reach of any "bilingual" professional development beyond the authorization itself. As evidenced by California's induction program standards, there is a marked absence of consideration of authorization-specific expectations when clearing a credential. The "extra" stipulations of any authorization, therefore, currently rest outside the institutional discourses of mainstream teaching or credentialing, and as such, reinforce separation of contexts in which bilingually "authorized" teachers teach. While acknowledgement of the different contextual needs of teachers and students is crucial, and the drafters of the *Bilingual Authorization Program Standards* write, should inform teacher induction involving bilingual teachers, misunderstandings of these contexts, based on California's language-as-problematic resource orientation, can also be consequential. Nicole Knight's comments, stated in Chapter 4, are important: "If I were to think, these are the type of programs that I need to have because this is what the State says, then I'm going to fall into... I have... my English Learners over here, and the rest of the school over here. Or, I have my bilingual strand and..."

At the district level, the ELLMA director was forthright in her rejection of the State's "antiquated" (to use her term) ideologies of and orientations to bilingual education. In contrast, the new teacher support manager did not question them, as she

interpreted the policy to point primarily to the importance of all OUSD students becoming proficient in English. While not the focus of this study, superficial distinction between these two departments' positions, one as "right" and one as "wrong," would miss how worthy of attention dimensions of time and space are to how each individual department leader came to understand bilingual education in California. It is important to note that Nicole Knight began her career as a bilingual elementary teacher in Oakland, at the same time Proposition 227 was taking effect, and the intersections of policy, pedagogy, and politics at that time doubtless influenced her outspoken positions on bilingualism and biliteracy. Alice Holst began (and continued) her career teaching in English, not in bilingual settings, before Proposition 227, and as such experienced the curricular, pedagogical, and classroom demographic shifts that took place in Oakland classrooms at the time. Each leader's institutional understandings of California public education arise from their professional contexts. These understandings, however, when applied to teachers in different contexts, may be insufficient on their own to wholly support early-career teachers.

At the school leadership level, Xiomara and Madeleine, both of whom developed their professional identities through their tenure in OUSD at Olmeda, spoke in agreement with the ELLMA director's vision of bilingual education. Wayne, newest to OUSD and bilingual education, yet one of the "oldest" to K-5 public education, was at the beginning of a trajectory of growth in understanding the historical, pedagogical, and cultural contexts of working at Olmeda. When left on his own to decide what he thought would be useful PD, Wayne drew upon his own contextual understandings to plan and conduct PD sessions. This context did not match the needs of teachers, specifically Melisa, who

taught in Spanish. Further, Wayne's lack of critical language awareness and consciousness resulted in awkward sessions that not only amounted to lost opportunities to push practice but also led Melisa to wonder out loud at her ability to understand her PD leader. Likely, unbeknownst to Wayne, at the same time Melisa was extending herself daily during her first year of teaching, she was also struggling to pass one of her credential exams. In addition to the threat of job loss if she failed, she had to pay for each attempt (five total), as well as pay for test preparation she believed would help her pass. Intersecting in terms of time, space, and power, Melisa was interpreting multiple experiences of "failure" over not just the previous years' efforts with a credential exam, but over a lifelong history of education, beginning with remediation in elementary school that positioned her as deficient – first as an English Learner, later as a teacher candidate, and then as a new teacher. While in agreement with Johnson's (2010) statement that "[e]ducators make choices - they are not helplessly caught in the ebb and flow of language policies, no matter how strong policy 'discourses' might be" (p. 76), this study uncovers one area where a new teacher was "caught" in a credentialing policy. The invisibility of emergency-credentialed and intern-permitted teachers among school and district policies of teacher support (evaluation, one-on-one coaching, etc.) was a surprise to me, and stands out as a policy area that requires immediate attention.

Drawing on Fairclough's notion of discourse exemplifying situational, institutional, and societal struggles, critical consciousness may be the pillar of bilingual/dual language teacher preparation that deepens our understandings of how language, and especially languages other than English, are tied to student and teacher

beliefs about their own identities, performances, and professional capacities. These identities are particularly vulnerable during the teachers' early years of practice.

As Xiomara said, at Olmeda, and in OUSD, "our biggest thing here is to build teacher capacity." Once hired by a school within a district that operated via distributed leadership, every credentialed teacher was viewed as coachable – not expendable – and Xiomara, who was fully committed to building capacity of fellow teachers, felt confined by the power exerted by BTSA, in terms of requirements that did not appear to build Sam's capacity as a teacher. She also displayed confinement to a discursive connection of "struggling learners" to English Learners, which in turn indicated her socialization into this discourse of the State. In terms of instructional coaching and PD, Olmeda teacher leaders, as well as the school itself, operated from their own positions of power, one which recognized a continuum of growth. There was no pass/fail pressure during PD or instructional coaching, but there was palpable pressure during the BTSA scoring sessions. Participants assigned the same power wielded by the CCTC to BTSA requirements, and subsequently to Xiomara, as the person who had to score their assignments. Continua and laws don't tend to operate in the same theoretical or practical spaces. In this way, Oakland, Olmeda, and individual teachers (minus Melisa) were expected to exist simultaneously in two spaces; one clearly bounded by a score on a BTSA project, and one site-based, gradual and unique to each teacher. This simultaneous existence appeared to complicate professional growth, both for coaches and for coachees.

As Sage was able to reflect on her teaching and connect the BTSA requirements to improvement of her teaching, it is possible to see how a "performance exam" (BTSA project) is a useful tool to be able to see how teachers are growing. However, the

instantiation of this requirement at a fixed time, with fixed consequences, runs counter to what we know about how people learn. In this manner, the points of intersection of time, space, and (for the most part) power aligned in a way that Sage could benefit. When she viewed the language of the State as not holding immediate implications for her credential, in other words she already possessed a bilingual authorization, she was able to resist a language-as-problematic-resource orientation. At the same time, when she was in a position of subordination to the State, she too resorted to the State's designation of English Learners and not "fully bilingual biliterate people." The completion of her BTSA portfolio in English demonstrates how the power of a performance assessment perceived to be English-only (like her PACT) continues to travel across time and space into school district and state requirements. Sam, who also already held the bilingual authorization, was more willing to question both the language of the authorization and the structure of his teaching environment as less-than-ideal. However, he too, when required to meet the State's demands, defaulted to doing what he could to comply with those demands, regardless of whether those demands helped him to become a stronger teacher. As the coach of people with very different situations yet held to the same timelines and evaluated according to the same criteria, Xiomara was left feeling "a little be horrible" about herself as a coach. In terms of future dimensions of time, space, and power, these feelings likely have impacted how she has since approached coaching.

Through close analysis of participant discourse and documents, in this study I have examined social structures and relationships within bilingual education. Study participants indexed relationships from compliance with to resistance to the social structure outlined most visibly by the State in CL-628B. Melisa, the most novice teacher,

reacted strongly and emotionally to the power she attributed to the bilingual authorization. As a result, she began to worry that she was not in compliance with the State. Even in the "safe" space of Olmeda, Melisa had mixed reactions to PD she did not find useful. At the beginning of the study, she was less vocal about the injustice she felt in terms of lack of support in Spanish. Later, Melisa questioned whether or not the inutility of this session was in part because of her shortcomings; she equivocated "I'm not sure if it's the person or if I'm just lost..." Over the course of the final weeks of data collection, she became more outspoken, demanding from Xiomara that the next year be different (i.e., PD in Spanish). Sage and Sam adhered to the BTSA portfolio requirements and both passed their portfolio, yet they had very different experiences both in terms of utility and in terms of emotional incidences. In this way, compliance with the State did not match the State's intended goals. While these considerations of time, space, and power build on scholars' work on language appropriation, they also extend this work in a new way that captures more thoroughly how these dimensions intersect to influence individuals' conditions and processes of policy production and interpretation.

Critical Consciousness in Bilingual Education

Extending research and reviews (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017, Dantas-Whitney & Waldschmidt, 2009; Guerrero & Lachance, 2018), the second section of this chapter explores more deeply the importance of critical consciousness as foundational to work in bilingual settings. My study supports Cervantes-Soon et al.'s review of literature that specifically looks for inequalities that "may go unrecognized when concentrating on conventional measures of success" (2017, p. 405). While BTSA stands out as the most prominent conventional measure that highlighted inequality in this study, other potential

areas of inequality Cervantes-Soon et al. concentrate on are teachers' backgrounds, preparation, and orientations. Active, articulated expectations of understandings as to how to "problematize the history, culture, and societal configurations" (Cervantes-Soon et al., 2017, p. 419) as related to local bilingual contexts, may make visible and challenge language policies such as California's bilingual authorization, as well as systems such as teacher induction, that have been shaped by particular social groups in their own contextual understandings. Building on Tollefson (2006), these social groups' contextual understandings tend to promote the interests of the dominant social groups. Valdiviezo writes that,

> [w]hile language dominance per se does not constitute a negative outcome, it ought to be contextualized in the structures and processes that shaped it, including the ideologies of exclusion that justified this dominance as well as the marginalization of speakers of other languages, particularly ethnolinguistic minorities. (2013, p. 14)

Though the dominance of English in any U.S. education setting appears logical and, in many U.S. schools, unquestioned, findings from this study highlight why this dominance should be questioned in a deliberately planned bilingual institution. In California, there is a very recent history of language erasure via the dismantling of bilingual education. While this direct democracy has swung away from legislative limitation of bilingual education, and OUSD may be working in one dimension to problematize and push back against the dominance of English, the power wielded by the State's credentialing authority (CCTC), in terms of both the bilingual authorization and teacher induction, conflicts with and at times overshadows this work. Early-career teachers must adhere

very closely to rules of credentialing until they have cleared their credentials and they must also adhere to policies of their employers. If these policies do not align, early-career teachers struggle. Returning to the "critical" foundation of this study, it is important, from a justice and action-oriented stance, to point out where these struggles are connected to social inequality and act upon these findings. Findings of this study resonate with Cammarata and Tedick (2012), Cervantes-Soon et al. (2017), and Faltis and Valdés (2016), who all call for more attention to teacher education in bilingual and linguistically diverse settings. In a bilingual school, a sole emphasis in English will never be useful to all teachers, and the messages about language ideologies and orientations that early-career teachers receive during their preparation and continuing education may stick with them more poignantly than skills-based training. In the context of this study, more attention to preparing teacher educators in languages other than English, by the State, the District, and Olmeda, would potentially begin to mitigate the frustration and injustice felt by teachers and coaches who want to be professionally developing in the languages through which they teach and coach. This, in turn, may minimize oppositional positioning of "us" and "them."

In terms of encounters analyzed in this study, critical consciousness as a theme connects most poignantly to PD sessions where Wayne struggled to plan and conduct meaningful opportunities for teacher growth. Wayne was a member of a district-wide group of instructional coaches that met regularly as their own professional learning community (PLC). This group provided support and space to develop as a coach and PD leader in English-speaking spaces. Because these coaches were hired by the district to develop teacher capacity to build literacy (and boost reading scores) in English, it is only

natural that the coaches honed their coaching craft around this area. As such, I consider that his position, though located at Olmeda, also expanded more broadly into a district-wide community during his own PLC sessions. We did not discuss this, but in retrospect this "district" affiliation in English-only may not only have limited Wayne's opportunities to become more educated about bilingual education; it may also have served to distance Wayne from fully integrating into the space of Olmeda. As is the case in many districts, Olmeda teachers tend to align themselves onsite with each other, at times in some sort of opposition (from mild to outspoken) to the District (i.e., administration). Though possible to operate in two spaces at one time – both at Olmeda and as part of a network of coaches, teachers at Olmeda may have delineated their own areas of space (e.g., Melisa - "I don't know if it's the person...").

While Wayne was required by the State to learn about EL education if he wanted to remain credentialed (and thereby employed) in OUSD, he was not required by anyone to learn about bilingual education. Since California does indeed have two distinct authorizations for two distinct settings (bilingual authorization and English Learner authorization, the CLAD), CLAD coursework does not necessarily overlap with bilingual authorization coursework. The institution where Wayne was enrolled in online CLAD coursework may or may not have also offered a bilingual authorization, and teachers in the classes may or may not have been teaching bilingually. This undefined space, where teachers in two distinct contexts may be grouped together, as I point out in Chapter 2 (e.g., Dantas-Whitney and Waldschmidt, 2009), may inadvertently promote conflicting messages around what bilingual education is and who it is for. This grouping of English

and bilingual teachers in teacher education reinforces rather than challenges an orientation toward English as the primary goal of bilingual instruction.

Finally, if English (only)-speaking teachers can be hired at bilingual schools in any context except teaching in a language other than English, there is no California state-level or Oakland district-level requirement that they understand the history or context of the bilingual program where they are employed. This contrasts with requirements of all other California teachers teaching in linguistically diverse settings. When thinking about Melisa's experience in PD, because Wayne did not have the critical language awareness to consider providing PD in Spanish, Melisa (and any other Spanish-teaching teacher) was left not only with an absence of support, she was left shouldering the burden to request and explain why there *should* be a meeting in Spanish. In this way, no matter the level (state, district, school), language is tied into social dimensions of power. This sort of consciousness is a subject Wayne likely would have eagerly studied. California has legislated efforts to improve the educational experiences and outcomes of emergent bilingual students. However, the non-English portion of bilingualism, including teacher education in languages other than English, remains far behind the pace of bilingualism in education and the needs of bilingual teachers. Though Wayne was indeed in the process of becoming more critically conscious, in some ways, of the history and inequities of EL education and supports, this consciousness training did not extend to bilingual pedagogies, histories, and the like. In any case, he was willing to push himself and his attempts, though sometimes awkward and requiring their own critical conversations, were attempts that demonstrate a need to explore, via humanizing research (Cervantes-Soon et

al., 2017) how, at Olmeda, problematic ideologies connected to Whiteness and monolingualism could be interrupted, questioned, and challenged.

As this study has shown, Sage, Sam, and Melisa, the three study participants in the positions of least power, were directly and indirectly impacted by how decision-makers were connected to the ideologies and orientations laid out in the bilingual authorization. Though others, such as district administrators, who have already been working in positions that require adherence to multiple education laws and regulations, may recognize room for negotiation between two bounded ends of "following rules" and "breaking rules," those newest to any profession are likely the people required to interpret and follow most narrowly rules and regulations of entry. In a state where voters have reaffirmed the value of bilingualism and biliteracy (in 2016, via Proposition 58), it is time to revise the bilingual authorization. DeJong et al. (2016) affirm the need of a complex view of "resource" that recognizes the multidimensionality of the language-as-resource orientation itself. In other words, different languages can be simultaneously positioned differently as resources within the same context. In Chapter 7, I explore implications of these ramifications more broadly, strengthening the critical positionality of this study. As such, I orient these findings and discussion toward critiquing and suggesting areas of change within the bilingual education policyscape in California.

Chapter 7

Concluding Remarks on a Field in Constant Motion

This study rests on a foundation of language, as to how, through discourse, we understand, value, and promote languages and their speakers in a public arena. The public arena examined here is public education, and this is an arena that, importantly, builds foundational understandings of how humans and language go together in society. Whether considering my first finding, that California's bilingual authorization promotes a language-as-problematic resource orientation, or subsequent findings around uneven, mismatched early-career bilingual teacher support, a default to English in high-stakes performance, or divisive positioning of teachers against "the system," it is expected that, even among progressive educators in the Bay Area, well known for its politically progressive policies, there is work to be done around the individual, institutional, and societal valuation of multilingualism and support of teachers to teach multilingually. In addition to discussing how this study holds implications for the field of critical language policy studies, this chapter addresses further implications for bilingual teacher preparation and continuing education, both locally and nationally.

To summarize, the findings of this study are fivefold. The first finding is that the state of California's legislative bodies and Commission on Teacher Credentialing promote an orientation toward bilingual education that doesn't match the visions of the bilingual teachers at Olmeda Elementary, OUSD's ELLMA office, nor subtle voices visible in California's bilingual authorization program standards. The language-as-problematic resource orientation produced by the State and taken somewhat for granted by monolingual participants in this study, is problematic. Any promotion of languages

other than English in bilingual education as less "academic" than English, or as secondary to English, devalues these languages, their speakers, and the teachers who teach in them. Early-career teachers in this study interpreted this unequal validation with varying degrees of discomfort, from outspoken resistance to self-minimization. The second finding, that distributed leadership may result in uneven and inequitable outcomes, extends Varghese's (2006) comments about the idea that being a Community of Practice (at Olmeda, an instructional leadership team member understanding, agreeing with, and capable of enacting the team's vision) cannot be taken for granted. "The roles of agency and advocacy in bilingual teaching have been assumed rather than addressed for too long because of the marginalized nature of the profession... Teacher agency and advocacy needs to be built into... professional development" (p. 223).

Though Varghese is discussing professional development of bilingual teachers-in-the-making, I extend her discussion to include bilingual teacher educators-in-the-making. The third finding, that early-career teachers can access professional development and grow through it when they are able to work within their individual zones of proximal development, is not surprising. However, what is visible in this study is how the structures of California's teacher induction requirement interrupted professional growth due to rigid timing or perceptions of English as the only language usable during induction. Connected to this third finding is the fourth, that when professional development tasks are viewed as interruptions to "real" professional growth – in other words, as hoops through which to jump – they also may position the requir*ers* of development, i.e. the District or the State, as forces to oppose. This oppositional positioning runs counter to collaboration paramount to successful growth in a classroom,

coaching, or other teaching and learning environment. Finally, the fifth finding, that English became the default language and English Learners became the default "struggling learners" during a BTSA project – even though the language of instruction was Spanish – connects directly back to the first finding's hierarchizing of English in bilingual education. In this manner, I have shown how, to use Levinson et al.'s (2009) terminology, the State, via its orientation to bilingualism and biliteracy in education, has defined reality, ordered behavior, and allocated resources in ways that promote inequality.

Implications for Understanding Language Policy in Schools, Districts, and States

This study contributes to the field of critical language policy studies both in terms of its findings and in terms of offering a different model for exploring how people and policies connect to each other. Continuing an established methodological process of combining ethnography with discourse analysis, this study provides a nuanced, local account of ways in which early-career bilingual teachers and their support network interpreted professional development – and critical examination of how these interpretations were linked, with uneven ramifications, to a language policy. It is my hope that the findings in this study will directly inform how OUSD and the CCTC consider first, two absences; the lack of specified support structures for emergency or provisionally-credentialed teachers, and the lack of articulated, designated options for bilingual teaching during induction. In addition, I hope that the CCTC will carefully reconsider the "antiquated" orientation to bilingual education that persists in the bilingual authorization and engage with those closest to the field in order to craft a more equitable and accurate authorization. It is also my hope that these findings may inform other states

and school districts who are working to draft or revise bilingual-specific licensure policies.

Valdiviezo (2013) highlights the importance of engaging teachers at points closer to legislative action. I, too, see an intersection in the field between language policy and planning (LPP) researchers and K-12 members, as well as between EPPs and LPP researchers, as to how scholars can engage local actors to better understand and disrupt problematic notions of bilingualism and bilingual education. Upon completion of this study, I see more clearly Ricento's (2015) comments as to the importance of broadening and strengthening the field beyond its sociolinguistic and ethnographic disciplines, into political theory, economics, and political science. As became evident from most respondents' reactions to CL-628B, voices in our current bilingual education landscape are not represented in the bilingual authorization. The better voices at all levels of the policyscape understand policy complexities from multiple angles, the more prepared we will be to enact change.

In terms of multidimensional models of understanding language policy production, interpretation, or appropriation, the critical interpretive nature of this study acknowledges that "…if we assume that our knowledge of texts is necessarily partial and incomplete…and if we assume that we are constantly seeking to extend and improve it, then we have to accept that our categories are always provisional and open to change" (Fairclough 2007, p. 15). What this means for dimensions of time, space, and power, is that these dimensions are constantly shifting, and this dissertation offers a portrait of a unique group of individuals who came together at a specific location over the course of a (relatively) short amount of time. While the findings that have come out of this study are

indeed important, careful attention and provision must be made to seek the multiple interpretations that help us better understand how people experience these dimensions in different ways. This, to me, is crucial responsibility of members of the language policy field who hold as a goal "critically conscious" work, and an important step to take if we are to transgress the oppositional discourses that currently permeate all public spaces.

Implications for Bilingual Teacher Education

This study provides insight to school districts, administrators, and EPPs as to how better to support the unique, specific needs of their bilingual teachers. In this section, I offer some suggestions for, specifically, in-service teacher education. This study has exposed a gap in credentialing as it is connected bilingual settings. While coursework and demonstrated understanding of bilingual methodology, along with the context for bilingual education and bilingualism, form two of the six program standards for the bilingual authorization, the lack of requirement that all certificated teacher-leaders in a bilingual school hold a bilingual authorization (or, at minimum, an English Learner authorization) leaves a gap in an important foundation on which to build. This absence was visible in professional development sessions led by Wayne, and it limited opportunities for growth, particularly for Melisa. Careful consideration of the qualifications of teacher educators in bilingual settings must include pedagogical language knowledge, that which Faltis and Valdés label a "potentially transformative avenue" (2016, p. 580) in teacher education. In addition, an expectation to demonstrate any sort of pedagogical language knowledge is not present in OUSD's BTSA guidelines. As OUSD classrooms are, on the whole, "linguistically diverse", continued attention to

refining early-career teachers' knowledge and practice around critical language, content, and pedagogical issues, would likely benefit teachers across program models.

These study findings also point to a need for opportunities for all bilingual teachers to engage in meaningful and relevant professional development in languages other than English. At the school level, for teachers to "succeed" at teaching bilingually, they must understand what the important elements necessary to bilingual-specific pedagogies are – and, just as importantly, have access to a community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991) that allows them to build their skills in their language of instruction. Further, they need time and space to "apprentice" into a community of skilled practitioners. It is important, then, for schools and districts to look closely at what policies are in place to ensure that these bilingual communities exist – and that all members have opportunities to engage in building shared understandings of school and district visions of bilingual education. More broadly, from the school through the district to state levels, it is important for there to be structures in place to sustain growing bilingual education communities locally, regionally, and beyond.

In this study, the BTSA project was often dismissed as a meaningful professional development opportunity. Instead, it was considered as a second (or third) PACT, something already done in "teacher school". This separation of "meaningful" from an ideally reflective inquiry practice is something to be explored in pre-service and in-service settings – particularly in bilingual settings. As California requires passage of an induction program within five years after preliminary credentialing, further consideration and collaboration on beneficial work for teachers, their induction support system, and induction program coordinators is important. Early-career teachers should be welcomed

into the field with systems that support their growth in ways that are meaningful and useful to them at an individual and institutional level. Otherwise, frustration and discouragement loom as obstacles to teacher satisfaction and retention.

Directions for Future Research

Extending Cammarata and Tedick's (2012) call for more targeted support of teachers in bilingual settings, and in agreement with Cervantes-Soon et al.'s (2017) call for "humanizing research" in bilingual education, which they deliberately label as two-way-immersion, a humanizing examination of bilingual teachers' experiences of targeted supports is an area of research to expand. Contrast humanizing research with "dehumanizing" research that "imagine[s] students as outcomes or critique[s] teachers for their own lack of language" (Cervantes-Soon et al., p. 421), the authors write that humanizing research requires collective ongoing, critical reflection. Even though my study was not planned as collaborative or action-oriented, I approached data collection and analysis with an intention to examine events from a position of humility. In doing so, I endeavored to refrain from criticism of individual study participants and instead looked for the multiple dimensions that informed their actions and experiences. As is the critical design of this study, I approached this work with the goal of identifying inequalities that may interrupt professional growth for early-career bilingual teachers. If I could change any aspect of data collection, I would have been more deliberate about discussing race and gender, alongside language, with participants, as these dimensions of participants' actions and experiences remained in the shadows of many interactions, and doubtless factored in to Sage's, Sam's, and Melisa's professional growth. As such, I call for further critical and humanizing research that does not shy away from the grittiness of race,

gender, and language, and their intersections with multilingual language policy in education.

Varghese and Snyder (2018) discuss the importance, in dual language teacher education, of providing professional development that includes identity work around personal histories of race, language, and marginalization in education – as, if done skillfully, this work can help reposition "dominant discourses" (p. 158) around these issues. While this kind of work holds implications for teacher education, I suggest it also holds implications for future research. In California, the generation of students directly impacted by Proposition 227, whose bilingual education may have been interrupted by an abrupt switch to English-only instruction, have now come of age and joined the workforce. Specific to the field of education, how has this history of contested (and likely removed) bilingual education shaped these educators' career choices? Who is teaching in bilingual settings, and what are their experiences?

Finally, as noted in Chapter 4, the infrequency with which the state of California has considered the field of bilingual education underlines how legislative movement does not keep pace with local appropriation of policies. Given the multiple forces in motion between classroom practice and legislative sessions, local actors will continue to move more agilely in response to local needs. Ideally, then, would be space for districts to remain responsive to local needs without being held to out-of-date compliance regulations. A broader public policy research agenda is necessary to envision the sorts of policy shifts that could enable California schools and districts to revision and begin to rebuild bilingual programs for our current generation of students.

Conclusion

This portrait of how various actors in Oakland navigate local and wider educational language policy contexts in California provides insight as to how the bilingual authorization is connected to teachers in one bilingual school. In this ethnographic language policy study, I examined ideologies of language circulating in bilingual education spaces – from the state level to individual teachers, and where these ideologies intersected among multiple dimensions of early-career teachers' professional experiences. What emerged are findings that demonstrate the importance, in systems of distributed leadership, to clear articulation and understandings of visions of bilingualism in education. Without this, individual early-career teachers struggled to be able to push their practice and positioned themselves "against" others – whether the others were administration or "other" language teachers. I see potential to revise these understandings of bilingual education in de Jong et al.'s (2016) proposal that Ruiz' (1984, 2010) orientations to language planning be extended, in a move away from "a" language-as-resource position, to "bilingualism" or "multilingualism"-as-resource. In their words, "the multilingualism-as-a resource orientation can begin to move away from competitive notions of resource to cooperative, inclusive policies and practices in multilingual societies" (p. 210). This competition, or divisiveness, when considered at individual, institutional, and societal dimensions, has ramifications, and must be countered with space, education, and people that hold critical consciousness – of language, language learners, and language teachers – at the center of professional development.

References

Ball, S.J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories, and toolboxes. *Discourse, 13*(2), 10-17.

Ball, S.J. (2006). *Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen Ball*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (2016). Following policy: Networks, network ethnography and education policy mobilities. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(5), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/02680939.2015.1122232

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2014). Transversing the Vertical Case Study: A Methodological Approach to Studies of Educational Policy as Practice. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *45*(2), 131-147. doi:10.1111/aeq.12055

Bartlett, L., & Vavrus, F. (2017). *Rethinking case study research: A comparative approach.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bernhardt, E., & Schrier, L. (1992). The development of immersion teachers. In E. Bernhardt (Ed.), *Life in language immersion classrooms* (pp. 113-131). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistic scales. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4*(1), 1-19. doi:10.1515/IP.2007.001

Blommaert, J. (2009). Ethnography and democracy: Hymes' political theory of language. *Text and Talk, 29*(3), 257-276.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 1439-1465.

Bunch, G. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learners in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education, 37*(1), 298-341. doi:10.3102/0091732X12461772

Bunch, G. C., Aguirre, J. M., & Téllez, K. (2009). Beyond the scores: Using candidate responses on high stakes performance assessment to inform teacher preparation for English learners. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(1), 103-128.

Calhoun, C. (1991). *Critical social theory: Culture, history, and the challenge of difference.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (n.d.a) About the Committee on Accreditation. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-about

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (n.d.b) Commission-Approved Educator Preparation Programs. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/data/app-edu-prep-prog.html

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (n.d.c). Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved from http://www.ctcexams.nesinc.com/FAQs.asp#Bilingual.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (1998). Coded Correspondence 98-9805 [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/coded/1998/989805.pdf?sfvrsn=0

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2004). Coded Correspondence 04-0001 [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/coded/040001/040001.pdf?sfvrsn=0

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008). *Accreditation Framework: Educator Preparation in California*. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009a). *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009b). *SB 2042 Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Program Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2010). Coded Correspondence 10-22 [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/coded/2010/1022.pdf?sfvrsn=0

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2011). A History of Policies and Forces Shaping California Teacher Credentialing [PDF file]. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2014). Bilingual Authorizations [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/leaflets/cl628b.pdf?sfvrsn=2

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2015a). Annual Report Card on California Teacher Preparation Programs for the Academic Year 2013-2014 as Required by Title II of the Higher Education Act [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/reports/titleii-2013-14-annualrpt.pdf

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2015b). Bilingual Authorization Program Standards. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/bilingual-authorization-handbook-pdf.pdf

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2015c). The Committee on Accreditation's Annual Accreditation Report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing 2014-2015 [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/commission/reports/coa_2014_15_annual_report.pdf?sfvrsn=0

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2015d). Preconditions for California Educator Preparation Programs [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/standards-preconditions.pdf

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016a). *Accreditation Framework Educator Preparation in California*. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016, July 8). Program Sponsor Alert 16-08: Adoption of Revised California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/ps-alerts/2016/psa-16-08.pdf?sfvrsn=0

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016a). [Interactive data search, Commission-Approved Educator Preparation Programs]. Retrieved from http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/data/app-edu-prep-prog.html

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016b). Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/prelimmsstandard-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=2

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016c). Multiple Subject and Single Subject Induction Program Standards [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/teacher-induction-precon-standards-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=59e14eb1_2

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2016d). Teacher Induction Program Preconditions and Program Standards [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/teacher-induction-precon-standards-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=59e14eb1_2

California Department of Education. (2018). Facts about English Learners in California. Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp

Cahnmann, M., Rymes, B., & Souto Manning, M. (2005). Using critical discourse analysis to understand and facilitate identification processes of bilingual adults becoming teachers. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal, 2*, 195-213.

Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal, 96*, 251-269. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781. 2012.01330.x

Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 153-169). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practices: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. *New* York: Routledge.

Carpenter, B.W., Diem, S., & Young, M.D. (2014). The influence of values and policy *vocabularies* on understandings of leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(9), 1110-1133. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2014.916008

Catalano, T. & Hamann, E.T. (2016). Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing "language as a resource" orientations in teacher education programs. *Bilingual Research Journal, 39*(3-4), 263-278. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2016.1229701

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education, 41*, 403-427.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics, and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 69-109). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Collins, J., Slembrouck, S., & Baynham, M. (2009). Introduction: Scale, migration, and communicative practice. In J. Collins, S. Slembrouck, & M. Baynham (Eds.), *Globalization and language in contact: Scale, migration, and communicative practices* (pp. 1-16). New York: Continuum.

The Condition of Education: English Language Learners in Public Schools. (n.d.) Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cgf.asp

Conteh, J. & Meier, G. (Eds.) (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language planning and social change.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2011) *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94,* 103-115.

Dantas-Whitney, M. & Waldschmidt, E.D. (2009) Moving Toward Critical Cultural Consciousness in ESOL and Bilingual Teacher Education, *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 32*(1), 60-76. DOI: 10.1080/15235880902965888

Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1996). A national survey: French immersion teachers' preparation and their professional development needs. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 52*(2), 248-270.

De Fina, A. (2009). Narratives in interviews: The case of accounts for an interactional approach to narrative genres. *Narrative Inquiry, 19*(2), 233-258, doi:10.1075/ni.19.2.03def

de Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

de Jong, E.J., Li, J., Zafar, A.M., & Wu, C.-H. (2016.) Language policy in multilingual contexts: Revisiting Ruiz' "language-as-resource" orientation. *Bilingual Research Journal, 39*(3-4), 200-212. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1224988

Delavan, M.G., Valdez, V.E., & Freire, J.A. (2016). Language as whose resource? When global economics usurp the local equity potentials of dual language education. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 0*(0), 1-15. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2016.1204890

Diem, S. Young, M.D., Welton, A.D., Mansfield, K.C., & Lee, P.L. (2014) The intellectual landscape of critical policy analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(9). 1068-1090. doi:10.1080/09518398.2014.916007

Eisenhart, M. (2016). A matter of scale: Multi-scale ethnographic research on education in the United States, *Ethnography and Education*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17457823.2016.1257947

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power.* London and New York, NY: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New

York, *NY*: Routledge.
Faltis, C. & Valdés, G. (2016). Preparing teachers to teach in and advocate for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 549-592). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy, 30*, 13-38.
Flores, N. (2017). From language as resource to language as struggle. In M. Flubacher & A. del Percio, Eds. *Language, education and neoliberalism: Critical studies in sociolinguistics* (pp. 62-81). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Flores, N. & García, O. (2017). A Critical Review of Bilingual Education in the United States: From Basements and Pride to Boutiques and Profit. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*, 14-29. doi: 10.1017/S0267190517000162
Galguera, T. (2011). Participant structures as professional learning tasks and the development of pedagogical language knowledge among preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 85-106. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ914925.pdf
García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
García, O. & Kelly-Holmes, H. (2016). Editorial. *Language Policy, 15*(1), 1-2. doi:10.1007/s10993-016-9401-7
García, O., Flores, N., & Woodley, H. (2012). Transgressing monolingualism and bilingual dualities: Translanguaging pedagogies. In A. Yiakoumetti (Ed.), *Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education* (pp. 45-75). Bern: Peter Lang.
Guerrero, M.D. & Lachance, J.R. (2018). *The national dual language education teacher preparation standards*. Albuquerque, NM: Dual Language Education of New Mexico.
Heath, S.B. & Street, B., with Mills, M. (2008) *Ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press and National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy (NCRLL)
Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography.* London: Longman.
Hornberger, N. H. (2015). Selecting appropriate research methods in LPP research. In F.M. Hult & D.C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide* (pp. 9-20). Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Hornberger, N.H., & Johnson, D.C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509-532.
Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, D., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Hult, F. M. (2010). Analysis of language policy discourses across the scales of space and time. *International Journal of The Sociology of Language, 2010*(202), 7-24. doi:10.1515/IJSL.2010.011

Hult, F. M. & Johnson, D. C., (Eds.) (2015). *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide*. Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Johnson, D. C. (2010). Implementational and ideological spaces in bilingual education language *policy*. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(1), 61-79. doi: 10.1080/13670050902780706

Johnson, D. C. (2013). Introduction: ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2013*(219), 1-6. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2013-0001

Johnson, D. C. (2015). Intertextuality and language policy. In F.M. Hult & D.C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide* (pp. 166-180). Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Johnson, D. C. & Johnson, E.J. (2015). Power and agency in language policy appropriation. *Language Policy, 14*, 221-243. doi: 10.1007/s10993-014-9333-z

Johnson, D. C. & Ricento, T. (2013). Conceptual and theoretical perspectives in language planning and policy: Situating the ethnography of language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2013*(219), 7-21. doi: 10.1515/ijsl-2013-0002

Jones, G. M., Rua, M. J., Carter, G. (1998). Science teachers' conceptual growth within Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35*, 967-985.

King, K.A. & Punti, G. (2012). On the margins: Undocumented students' narrated experiences of (il)legality. *Linguistics and Education*, *23*(1), 235-249.

Kleyn, T., López, D. & Makar, C. (2015) What about bilingualism? A critical reflection on the edTPA with teachers of Emergent Bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal, 38*(1). 88-106, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2015.1017029

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lemke, J. L. (2000). Across the scales of time: Artifacts, activities, and meanings in ecosocial systems. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, *7*(4), 273-290.

Levinson, B. A. U., Sutton, M., & Winstead, T. (2009). Education policy as a practice of power: Theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options. *Educational Policy*, *26*, 369-393. doi: 10.1177/0895904808320676

Levinson, B. A. U. (2011). *Beyond critique: Exploring critical social theories and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lo Bianco, J. (2001). Language and literacy policy in Scotland—SCILT. Retrieved from http://www.scilt.org.uk/Portals/ 24/Library/publications/languageandliteracy/Language%20and%20literacy%20policy%20in%20Scotland_full% 20document.pdf

López, F., & Santibañez, L. (2018). Teacher preparation for emergent bilingual students: Implications of evidence for policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 26*(36) 2-47. http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2866

McCarty, T. L. (Ed.) (2011). *Ethnography and language policy.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McCarty, T. (2015). Ethnography in language planning and policy research. In F.M. Hult & D.C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A*

practical guide (pp. 69-80). Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Macias, Reynaldo F. (1979). Language choice and human rights in the United States. In J.E. Alatis *(Ed.), Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics 1979* (pp. 86-101). Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. London: Longman.
May, S., (Ed.) (2013). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Menken, K., & Antuñez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Retrieved at http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED455231.pdf
Mercado, C. & Brochin-Ceballos, C. (2011) Growing quality teachers. In Flores, B.B., Sheets, R.H., Clark, E.R. (Eds.), *Teacher preparation for bilingual school populations: Educar para transformar* (pp. 217-229). New York, NY: Routledge.
Merriam, S.B. & Tisdell, E.J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation, 4th edition.* San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
Mortimer, K. S. (2013). Communicative event chains in an ethnography of Paraguayan language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 219*, 67-99. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2013-0005
Mortimer, K.S. (2016). Producing change and stability: A scalar analysis of Paraguayan bilingual education policy implementation. *Linguistics and Education, 34*, 58-69. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2015.08.001
Mortimer, K. S., & Wortham, S. (2015). Analyzing language policy and social identification across heterogeneous scales. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 160-172.
Oakland Unified School District. (n.d.) Download the Dual Language Fact Sheet [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.ousd.org/Page/15094
Oakland Unified School District. (n.d.). Newsroom / Press Releases. Retrieved from https://www.ousd.org/Page/13526
Oakland Unified School District. (2015). *Quality School Development Policy Administrative Regulations.* Oakland, CA: OUSD.
Oakland Unified School District. (2016a). *Oakland BTSA Program Inquiry Cycle.* Oakland, CA: OUSD.
Oakland Unified School District. (2016b). *Oakland BTSA credentialing program handbook, 2016-2017*. Oakland, CA: OUSD.
Oakland Unified School District. (2018). Retention of Teachers at School Sites [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://dashboards.ousd.org/t/HR/views/RetentionDashboardInternal/TeachersatSites?:embed=y&:showShareOptions=true&:display_count=no&:showVizHome=no#1

Oakland Unified School District. (2016). Roadmap to ELL Achievement [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1XB6MV6ZnJxUHVLWVlURVhlcE0/view

PACT Consortium. (2009). Elementary Literacy Teaching Event Candidate Handbook 2014-15 [PDF file]. Retrieved from http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Teaching_Event_Handbooks#Handbooks

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy, 4*(4), 395-416.

Pew Research Center. (2017). Demographic profile of Hispanics in California, 2014. Retrieved from https://www.pewhispanic.org/states/state/ca/

Pinnell, G.S. & Fountas, I.C. (2007). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades K-8: Behaviors and understandings to notice, teach, and support*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(3), 348-368. https://doi-org.ezp2.lib.umn.edu/10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00296.x

Ricento, T. (2006). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ricento, T. (2015). Foreword. In F.M. Hult & D.C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide* (xii-xiv). Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Rizvi, F., and Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rogers, R. (Ed.) (2011). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rogers, R., Schaenen, I., Schott, C., O'Brien, K., Trigos-Carrillo, L., Starkey, K., & Chasteen, C.C. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis in education: A review of the literature, 2004 to 2012. *Review of Educational Research,* 1-35. doi:10.3102/0034654316628993

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the Association for Bilingual Education, 8*(2), 15-34.

Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Scheinin, R. (2017, November 16). As housing supply shrinks, San Francisco, San Jose and Oakland are nation's three most competitive markets. *The Mercury News.* Retrieved from https://www.mercurynews.com/2017/11/16/as-the-housing-supply-shrinks-san-francisco-san-jose-and-oakland-are-the-nations-three-most-competitive-markets/

Shabani, K., Khatib, M., & Ebadi, S. (2010). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development:

Instructional implications and teachers' professional development. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 237-248.
Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1-22.
Spolsky, B. (2012). What is language policy? In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 1-15). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
Stepler, R. & Lopez, M.H. (2016). U.S. Latino population growth and dispersion has slowed since onset of the Great Recession. [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.pewhispanic.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/09/PH_2016.09.08_Geography.pdf
Stern, N. (2009). History of bilingual education. In Provenzo, E.F. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of the social and cultural foundations of education* (pp. 66-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(1), 25-42.
Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Education policy and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.
Tedick, D.J., Christian, D., & Fortune, T. (Eds.) (2011). *Immersion education: Practices, policies, possibilities.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Tollefson, J.W. (2006). Critical theory in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.) *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 42-59). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
Tollefson, J. W. (2013). Language policy in a time of crisis and transformation. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 3-15). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Tollefson, J.W. (2015). Language education policy in late modernity: insights from situated approaches—commentary. *Language Policy, 14,* 183-189. doi:1007/s10993-014-9353-8
United States Census Bureau. (2018). QuickFacts California. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/ca
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. (1973). Lau v. Nichols, 483 F.2d 791.
United States Supreme Court. (1974). Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563.
Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67,* 391-429.
Valdiviezo, L. A. (2013). Vertical and horizontal approaches to ethnography of language policy in Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 219,* 23-46. doi:10.1515/ijsl-2013-0003
van Dijk, T.A. (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, XXX/1-2, 11-40.
Varghese, M. (2004). Professional development for bilingual teachers in the United States: Articulating and contesting professional roles. In J. Brutt-Griffler and M.

Varghese (Eds.), *Bilingualism and language pedagogy* (pp. 130-145). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
Varghese, M. (2006). Bilingual teachers-in-the-making in Urbantown. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27*(3), 211-224. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434630608668776
Varghese, M. & Snyder, R. (2018). Critically examining the agency and professional identity development of novice dual language teachers through figured worlds. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 12*(3), 145-159. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2018.1474060
Varghese, M. (2008). Using Cultural Models to Unravel How Bilingual Teachers Enact Language Policies. *Language and Education, 22*(5), 289-306. doi: 10.2167/le795.0
Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Warford, M. K. (2011). The zone of proximal *teacher* development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 252-258.
Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2008). An ecology metaphor for educational policy analysis: A call to complexity. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 153-167.
Widdowson, H. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4*, 157-172.
Widdowson, H. (1996). Reply to Fairclough: Discourse and interpretation: Conjectures and refutations. *Language and Literature, 5*, 57-69.
Widdowson, H. (1998). The theory and practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 136-151.
Wilson, W. H., & Kawai'ai'a, K. (2007). I kumu I lala: "Let there be sources, let there be branches": Teacher education in the College of Hawaiian Language. *Journal of American Indian Education, 46*(3) 37-53.
Wolcott, H. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Woodside-Jiron, H. (2011). Language, power, and participation: Using Critical Discourse Analysis to make sense of public policy. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 154-182). New York, NY: Routledge.
Woolard, K.A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B.B. Schieffelin, K.A. Woolard, & P.V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* [Kindle version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com
Woolard, K. & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 23*, 55-82.
Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identity and academic learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Wortham, S. (2012). Beyond macro and micro in the linguistic anthropology of education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 43(2), 128-137.
Zillow. (n.d.). Oakland CA Home Prices and Home Values. Retrieved December 27, 2017, from https://www.zillow.com/oakland-ca/home-values/
Zwiers, J. & Crawford, M. (2011). Academic conversations: *Classroom talk that fosters critical thinking and content understandings.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Appendix A

CL-628B – Page 1

State of California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95811-4213
Email: credentials@ctc.ca.gov
Website: www.ctc.ca.gov

BILINGUAL AUTHORIZATIONS

Bilingual Authorizations allow the holders to provide instruction to English Learners (EL). Assembly Bill (AB) 1871, signed by the Governor on September 30, 2008, provides for the issuance of bilingual authorizations rather than certificates, and expanded the options available to meet the requirements for the Bilingual Authorization. For a summary of all documents that authorize instruction to EL students, see the leaflet *Serving English Learners,* CL-622. The section below lists the types of instruction authorized by Bilingual Authorizations. Each type of instruction is defined below.

Types of Instruction to English Learners Authorized by the Bilingual authorization

- Instruction for English Language Development (ELD)
- Instruction for Primary Language Development
- Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE)
- Content Instruction Delivered in the Primary Language

Definitions of Types of Instruction

Instruction for *English language development* (ELD) means instruction designed specifically for EL students to develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. This type of instruction is also known as *English as a Second Language* (ESL) or *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (TESOL).

Instruction for *primary language development* means instruction for EL students to develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in their primary language.

Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE) means instruction in a subject area delivered in English that is specially designed to provide EL students with access to the curriculum.

Content Instruction Delivered in the Primary Language means instruction for EL students in a subject area delivered in the students' primary language.

Authorization

English Language Development (ELD) and instruction for primary language development are generally authorized at the level indicated by the holder's prerequisite credential (see list of prerequisites in #1, below) including preschool, grades K-12 and in classes organized primarily for adults. With a Children's Center Instructional Permit, Child Development Permit or a Children's Center Supervision Permit, ELD and instruction for primary language development are limited to the programs authorized by the permits. With a Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in adult education, ELD and instruction for primary language development are limited to classes organized primarily for adults. With all prerequisite credentials or permits, Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE) and content instruction delivered in the primary language are authorized in the subjects and grade levels of the prerequisite credential or permit.

Appendix B

Tables 5 and 6 – ILT Agendas and Planner

Table 5

ILT Agendas

Date	Outcomes, Actions	Notes
April 11, 2017 (W.A, X.G, M.B., K.M. present)	Outcomes: Plan cycle 5 writing cycle Actions: Overview of cycle Weeks at a glance	Writing cycle How are we teaching writing in the other language who isnt using Lucy. Go to Writing Standards 6 weeks Overview: Within our content units (outside of Lucy) how are we teaching writing. Social studies Standard Based and ELD aligned Week 1: writing process/ cycle overview TEachers go into their current unit and everyone comes up with a writing project that students will engage with. Week 2 : Creating rubric, writing an anchor paper
April 25, 2017 (W.A, absent: X.G, M.B., K.M present, plus one non-study participant)	Outcomes: Plan the cycle 5 writing cycle Actions: Review Cycle 5 plan Complete Cycle 5 plan (notes in table below)	Notes: We want to do what we see as a need, so we are asking classroom teachers to say where they see their needs. 1st grade has to build off writing primarily in Spanish (both in Eng and Sp) - if they start G1 with low Spanish writing, there's little to build on in either language. In G1, one teacher is doing the bulk of writing instruction in one

		language and the other teacher builds on that in other language (bulk=the curriculum) Ensure that K teachers recognize that drawing is writing - how to build in more detail to drawing? Tomorrow we'll start with standards, doing progression - teacher will present their grade-level standards and other teachers will take notes on connections with grades pre and post grades (one level). Connection notes will be displayed so we can make progression.
May 16 and 31, 2017 (W.A, absent: X.G, M.B., K.M present, plus one or two non-study participants)	Outcomes/Actions: (*none related to Cycle 5 PD are listed*) Outcomes/Actions: (*none related to Cycle 5 PD are listed*)	*No notes related to Cycle 5/PD planning were taken*

Table 6

Cycle 5 Writing Planner Attached to 4/25, 5/15, and 5/31 Agendas

Cycle 5 Writing

Week	PD	Grade Level PLC
Week 1	Standards Writing expectations of each grade level progression	Supplies: Writing standards, poster paper, markers, notetaker
Week 2	Writing process/cycle overview Teachers go back to your current unit and generate a writing project/sample	
Week 3	Write an anchor paper Create a rubric for the final project	
Week 4	RAFT	RAFT is a writing strategy that can be used in all content areas and offers students a choice in their writing assignment. R stands for Role - the person or thing that students will become. A is for Audience - the person or people who will be reading the finished product.
Week 5		Analyze RAFT writing with a rubric
Week 6 May 24th		

Appendix C

Transcription Conventions

.	falling intonation followed by noticeable pause (as at the end of declarative sentence)
?	rising intonation followed by noticeable pause (as at the end of interrogative sentence)
,	continuing intonation: may be a slight rise or fall in contour; may not be followed by a pause
->	flat intonation (as in lists)
::	elongated vowel or consonant sound
!	animated tone, not necessarily an exclamation
Bold	emphatic stress
CAPS	very emphatic stress
[	overlapping speech
=	latching (no pause between speakers)
@	laughter (the amount of @ roughly indicates the duration of laughter)
“ ”	reported speech
--	self-interruption; break in the word, sound abruptly cut off
(.)	short pause
(…)	longer pause
(h)	exhalation (sigh)
((smiling))	non linguistic action
< >	uncertain transcription
((…))	incomprehensible
( )	decreased volume

Adapted from Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32, 1439-1465, De Fina, A. (2009). Narratives in interviews: The case of accounts for an interactional approach to narrative genres. *Narrative Inquiry*, *19*(2), 233-258, doi:10.1075/ni.19.2.03def, King, K.A. & Punti, G. (2012). On the margins: Undocumented students’ narrated experiences of (il)legality. *Linguistics and Education*, *23*(1), 235-249.